E 449
.H221

TWO LETTERS

ON

SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES,

Addressed to Thomas Clarkson, Esq.

BY

J. H. HAMMOND.

COLUMBIA:
ALLEN, McCARTER, & Co.
THE S[illegible] CAROLINIAN PRESS.

1845.

TWO LETTERS

ON

SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES,

Addressed to Thomas Clarkson, Esq.

BY

J. H. HAMMOND.

COLUMBIA:
ALLEN, McCARTER, & Co.
THE SOUTH-CAROLINIAN PRESS.

1845.

454,50
,04

11-3316

TWO LETTERS

ON

SOUTHERN SLAVERY.

ADDRESSED TO THOMAS CLARKSON, ESQ.

SILVER BLUFF, South Carolina,
JANUARY 23, 1845.

SIR:—I received a short time ago, a letter from the Rev. WILLOUGHBY M. DICKINSON, dated at your residence, "Playford Hall, near Ipswich, 26th Nov., 1844," in which was inclosed a copy of your Circular Letter addressed to professing Christians in our Northern States, having no concern with Slavery, and to others there. I presume that Mr. DICKINSON's letter was written with your knowledge, and the document inclosed with your consent and approbation. I therefore feel that there is no impropriety in my addressing my reply directly to yourself, especially as there is nothing in Mr. DICKINSON's communication, requiring serious notice. Having abundant leisure, it will be a recreation to me to devote a portion of it to an examination and free discussion of the question of Slavery as it exists in our Southern States: and since you have thrown down the gauntlet to me, I do not hesitate to take it up.

Familiar as you have been with the discussions of this subject in all its aspects, and under all the excitements it has occasioned for sixty years past, I may not be able to present much that will be new to you. Nor ought I to indulge the hope of materially affecting the opinions you have so long cherished, and so zealously promulgated. Still, time and experience have developed facts, constantly furnishing fresh tests to opinions formed sixty years since, and continually placing this great question in points of view, which could scarcely occur to the most consummate intellect even a quarter of a century ago: And which may not have occurred yet to those whose previous convictions, prejudices and habits of thought have thoroughly and permanently biassed them to one fixed way of looking at the matter: While there are peculiarities in the operation of every social system, and special local as

well as moral causes materially affecting it, which no one, placed at the distance you are from us, can fully comprehend or properly appreciate. Besides, it may be possibly, a novelty to you to encounter one who conscientiously believes the Domestic Slavery of these States to be not only an inexorable necessity for the present, but a moral and humane institution, productive of the greatest political and social advantages, and who is disposed, as I am, to defend it on these grounds.

I do not propose, however, to defend the African Slave Trade. That is no longer a question. Doubtless great evils arise from it as it has been, and is now conducted: unnecessary wars and cruel kidnapping in Africa: the most shocking barbarities in the Middle Passage: and perhaps a less humane system of slavery in countries continually supplied with fresh laborers at a cheap rate. The evils of it, however, it may be fairly presumed, are greatly exaggerated. And if I might judge of the truth of transactions stated as occurring in this trade, by that of those reported as transpiring among us, I should not hesitate to say, that a large proportion of the stories in circulation are unfounded, and most of the remainder highly colored.

On the passage of the Act of Parliament prohibiting this trade to British subjects rests what you esteem the glory of your life. It required twenty years of arduous agitation, and the intervening extraordinary political events, to convince your countrymen, and among the rest your pious King, of the expediency of this measure: and it is but just to say, that no one individual rendered more essential service to the cause than you did. In reflecting on the subject, you must often ask yourself: What after all has been accomplished; how much human suffering has been averted; how many human beings have been rescued from transatlantic slavery? And on the answers you can give these questions, must in a great measure I presume, depend the happiness of your life. In framing them, how frequently must you be reminded of the remark of Mr. Grosvenor, in one of the early debates upon the subject, which I believe you have yourself recorded, "that he had twenty objections to the abolition of the Slave Trade: the first was, *that it was impossible*—the rest he need not give." Can you say to yourself, or to the world, that this *first* objection of Mr. Grosvenor has been yet confuted? It was estimated at the commencement of your agitation in 1787, that forty-five thousand Africans were annually transported to America and the West Indies. And the mortality of the Middle Passage, computed by some at 5, is now admitted not to have exceeded 9 per cent. Notwithstanding your Act of Parliament, the previous abolition by the United States, and that all the powers in the world have subsequently prohibited this trade—some of the greatest of them declaring it piracy, and covering the African seas with armed vessels to prevent it—Sir Thomas Fowel Buxton, a coadjutor of

yours, declared in 1840, that the number of Africans now annually sold into slavery beyond the sea, amounts, at the very least, to one hundred and fifty thousand souls; while the mortality of the Middle Passage has increased, in consequence of the measures taken to suppress the trade, to 25 or 30 per cent. And of the one hundred and fifty thousand slaves who have been captured and liberated by British Men of War since the passage of your Act, Judge JAY, an American Abolitionist, asserts that one hundred thousand, or two-thirds, have perished between their capture and liberation. Does it not really seem that Mr. GROSVENOR was a Prophet? That though nearly all the "impossibilities" of 1787 have vanished, and become as familiar *facts* as our household customs, under the magic influence of Steam, Cotton and universal peace, yet this wonderful prophecy still stands, defying time and the energy and genius of mankind. Thousands of valuable lives and fifty millions of pounds sterling have been thrown away by your Government in fruitless attempts to overturn it. I hope you have not lived too long for your own happiness, though you have been spared to see that in spite of all your toils and those of your fellow laborers, and the accomplishment of all that human agency could do, the African Slave Trade has increased three-fold under your own eyes—more rapidly, perhaps, than any other ancient branch of commerce—and that your efforts to suppress it have effected *nothing more* than a three-fold increase of its horrors. There is a God who rules this world—All powerful—Farseeing: He does not permit His creatures to foil His designs. It is He who, for His allwise, though to us often inscrutable purposes, throws "impossibilities" in the way of our fondest hopes and most strenuous exertions. Can you doubt this?

Experience having settled the point, that this Trade *cannot be abolished by the use of force*, and that blockading squadrons serve only to make it more profitable and more cruel, I am surprised that the attempt is persisted in, unless it serves as a cloak to some other purposes. It would be far better than it now is, for the African, if the trade was free from all restrictions, and left to the mitigation and decay which time and competition would surely bring about. If kidnapping, both secretly and by war made for the purpose, could be by any means prevented in Africa, the next greatest blessing you could bestow upon that country would be to transport its actual slaves in comfortable vessels across the Atlantic. Though they might be perpetual bondsmen, still, they would emerge from darkness into light—from barbarism to civilization—from idolatry to christianity—in short from death to life.

But let us leave the African slave trade, which has so signally defeated the *Philanthropy* of the world, and turn to American slavery to which you have now directed your attention, and against which a crusade has been preached as enthusiastic and ferocious as that of Peter the Hermit—destined, I believe, to be about as successful. And here let me say, there is a vast difference

between the two, though you may not acknowlege it. The wisdom of ages has concurred in the justice and expediency of establishing rights by prescriptive use, however tortious, in their origin they may have been. You would deem a man insane, whose keen sense of equity would lead him to denounce your right to the lands you hold, and which perhaps you inherited from a long line of ancestry, because your title was derived from a Saxon or Norman conqueror, and your lands were originally wrested by violence from the vanquished Britons. And so would the New England Abolitionist regard any one who would insist that he should restore his farm to the descendants of the slaughtered Red men to whom God had as clearly given it as he gave life and freedom to the kidnapped African. That time does not consecrate wrong, is a fallacy which all history exposes; and which the best and wisest men of all ages and professions of religious faith have practically denied. The means, therefore, whatever they may have been, by which the African race now in this country have been reduced to slavery, cannot affect us, since they are our property, as your land is yours, by inheritance or purchase and prescriptive right. You will say that man cannot hold *property in man.* The answer is, that he can and *actually does* hold property in his fellow all the world over, in a variety of forms, and *has always done so.* I will show presently his authority for doing it.

If you were to ask me whether I was an advocate of slavery in the abstract, I should probably answer, that I am not, according to my understanding of the question. I do not like to deal in abstractions. It seldom leads to any useful ends. There are few universal truths. I do not now remember any single moral truth universally acknowledged. We have no assurance that it is given to our finite understanding to comprehend abstract moral truth. Apart from Revelation and the Inspired Writings, what ideas should we have even of God, Salvation and Immortality? Let the Heathen answer. Justice itself is impalpable as an abstraction, and abstract liberty the merest phantasy that ever amused the imagination. This world was made for man, and man for the world as it is. Ourselves, our relations with one another and with all matter are real, not ideal. I might say that I am no more in favor of slavery in the abstract, than I am of poverty, disease, deformity, idiocy or any other inequality in the condition of the human family; that I love perfection, and think I should enjoy a Millenium such as God has promised. But what would it amount to? A pledge that I would join you to set about eradicating those apparently inevitable evils of our nature, in equalizing the condition of all mankind, consummating the perfection of our race, and introducing the Millenium? By no means. To effect these things, belongs exclusively to a Higher Power. And it would be well for us to leave the Almighty to perfect His own works and fulfil His own Covenants. Especially,

as the history of the past shows how entirely futile all human efforts have proved, when made for the purpose of aiding Him in carrying out even his revealed designs, and how invariably he has accomplished them by unconscious instruments, and in the face of human expectation. Nay more, that every attempt which has been made by fallible man to extort from the world obedience to his "abstract" notions of right and wrong, has been invariably attended with calamities, dire and extended just in proportion to the breadth and vigor of the movement. On slavery in the abstract, then, it would not be amiss to have as little as possible to say. Let us contemplate it as it is. And thus contemplating it, the first question we have to ask ourselves is, whether it is contrary to the Will of God, as revealed to us in His Holy Scriptures—the only certain means given us to ascertain His Will. If it is, then slavery is a sin. And I admit at once that every man is bound to set his face against it, and to emancipate his slaves should he hold any.

Let us open these Holy Scriptures. In the twentieth chapter of Exodus, seventeenth verse, I find the following words: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's"—which is the Tenth of those commandments that declare the essential principles of the Great Moral Law delivered to Moses by God Himself. Now, discarding all technical and verbal quibbling as wholly unworthy to be used in interpreting the Word of God, what is the plain meaning, undoubted intent, and true spirit of this commandment? Does it not emphatically and explicitly forbid you to disturb your neighbor in the enjoyment of his property; and more especially of that which is here specifically mentioned as being lawfully and by this commandment made sacredly his? Prominent in the catalogue stands his "man-servant and his maid-servant," who are thus distinctly *consecrated as his property* and guarantied to him for his exclusive benefit in the most solemn manner. You attempt to avert the otherwise irresistible conclusion, that slavery was thus ordained by God, by declaring that the word "slave" is not used here, and is not to be found in the Bible. And I have seen many learned dissertations on this point from Abolition pens. It is well known that both the Hebrew and Greek words translated "servant" in the Scriptures, mean also and most usually "slave." The use of the one word instead of the other was a mere matter of taste with the Translators of the Bible, as it has been with all the commentators and religious writers, the latter of whom have I believe for the most part adopted the term "slave, or used both terms indiscriminately. If, then, these Hebrew and Greek words include the idea of both systems of servitude, the conditional and unconditional, they should, as the major includes the minor proposition, be always translated "slaves" unless the sense of the whole text forbids it. The

real question, then is, what idea is intended to be conveyed by the words used in the commandment quoted? And it is clear to my mind that as no limitation is affixed to them, and the express intention was to secure to mankind the peaceful enjoyment of every species of property, that the terms "Men servants and Maid servants" include all classes of servants, and establish a lawful, exclusive and indefeasible interest equally in the "Hebrew Brother who shall go out in the seventh year" and "the yearly hired servant," and those "purchased from the Heathen round about," who were to be "Bondmen forever," *as the property of their fellow man.*

You cannot deny that there were among the Hebrews "Bond-men forever." You cannot deny that God especially authorized his chosen people to purchase "Bond-men forever" from the Heathen, as recorded in the *25th chap. of Leviticus*, and that they are there designated by the very Hebrew word used in the Tenth commandment. Nor can you deny that a "BOND-MAN FOREVER" is a "SLAVE;" yet you endeavor to hang an argument of immortal consequence upon the wretched subterfuge, that the precise word "slave" is not to be found in the *translation* of the Bible. As if the Translators were canonical expounders of the Holy Scriptures, and *their words*, not *God's meaning*, must be regarded as His Revelation.

It is vain to look to Christ or any of his Apostles to justify such blasphemous perversions of the word of God. Although slavery in its most revolting form was every where visible around them, no visionary notions of piety or philanthropy ever tempted them to gainsay the LAW, even to mitigate the cruel severity of the existing system. On the contrary, regarding slavery as an *established* as well as *inevitable condition of human society*, they never hinted at such a thing as its termination on earth, any more than that "the poor may cease out of the land," which God affirms to Moses shall never be: and they exhort "all servants under the yoke" to "count their masters as worthy of all honor:" "to obey them in all things accordings to the flesh; not with eye-service as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God:" "not only the good and gentle, but also the froward:" "for what glory is it if when ye are buffetted for your faults ye shall take it patiently? but if when ye do well and suffer for it ye take it patiently, this is acceptable of God." St. Paul actually apprehended a runaway slave and sent him to his master! Instead of deriving from the Gospel any sanction for the work you have undertaken, it would be difficult to imagine sentiments and conduct more strikingly in contrast than those of the Apostles and the Abolitionists.

It is impossible therefore to suppose that slavery is contrary to the Will of God. It is equally absurd to say that American slavery differs in form or principle from that of the chosen People. *We accept the Bible terms as the definition of our slavery, and its precepts as the guide of our conduct.* We

desire nothing more. Even the right to "buffet," which is esteemed so shocking, finds its express license in the Gospel. 1 *Peter ii.* 20. Nay, what is more, God directs the Hebrews to "bore holes in the ears of their brothers" to *mark* them, when under certain circumstances they become *perpetual slaves: Ex. xxi.* 6.

I think, then, I may safely conclude, and I firmly believe, that American slavery is not only not a sin, but especially commanded by God through Moses, and approved by Christ through His Apostles. And here I might close its defence; for what God ordains and Christ sanctifies should surely command the respect and toleration of Man. But I fear there has grown up in our time a Transcendental Religion which is throwing even Transcendental Philosophy into the shade—a Religion too pure and elevated for the Bible; which seeks to erect among men a higher standard of Morals than the Almighty has revealed or our Saviour preached; and which is probably destined to do more to impede the extension of God's Kingdom on earth than all the Infidels who have ever lived. Error is error. It is as dangerous to deviate to the right hand as the left. And when men, professing to be holy men, and who are by numbers so regarded, declare those things to be sinful which our Creator has expressly authorized and instituted, they do more to destroy His authority among mankind than the most wicked can effect by proclaiming that to be innocent which He has forbidden. To this self-righteous and self-exalted class belong all the Abolitionists whose writings I have read. With them it is no end of the argument to prove your propositions by the text of the Bible, interpreted according to its plain and palpable meaning, and as understood by all mankind for three thousand years before their time. They are more ingenious at construing and interpolating to accommodate it to their new-fangled and etherial code of morals, than ever were Voltaire or Hume in picking it to pieces to free the world from what they considered a delusion. When the Abolitionists proclaim "man-stealing" to be a sin, and show me that it is so written down by God, I admit them to be right, and shudder at the idea of such a crime. But when I show them that to hold "bond-men forever" is ordained by God, *they deny the Bible, and set up in its place a Law of their own making.* I must then cease to reason with them on this branch of the question. Our religion differs as widely as our manners. The Great Judge in our day of final account must decide between us.

Turning from the consideration of slave-holding in its relations to man as an accountable being, let us examine it in its influence on his political and social state. Though, being foreigners to us, you are in no wise entitled to interfere with the civil institutions of this country, it has become quite common for your countrymen to decry slavery as an enormous political evil to us, and even to declare that our Northern States ought to withdraw from the

Confederacy rather than continue to be contaminated by it. The American Abolitionists appear to concur fully in these sentiments, and a portion at least of them are incessantly threatening to dissolve the Union. Nor should I be at all surprised if they succeed. It would not be difficult, in my opinion, to conjecture which region, the North or South, would suffer most by such an event. For one I should not object, by any means, to cast my lot in a confederacy of States whose citizens might all be slave-holders.

I indorse without reserve the much-abused sentiment of Gov. M'DUFFIE, that "slavery is the corner stone of our Republican edifice;" while I repudiate, as ridiculously absurd, that much-lauded but no-where accredited dogma of Mr. JEFFERSON, that "all men are born equal." No Society has ever yet existed, and I have already incidentally quoted the highest authority to show that none ever will exist, without a natural variety of classes. The most marked of these must in a country like ours, be the rich and the poor, the educated and the ignorant. It will scarcely be disputed that the very poor have less leisure to prepare themselves for the proper discharge of public duties than the rich; and that the ignorant are wholly unfit for them at all. In all countries save ours these two classes, or the poor rather, who are presumed to be necessarily ignorant, are by law expressly excluded from all participation in the management of public affairs. In a Republican Government this cannot be done. Universal suffrage, though not essential in theory, seems to be in fact a necessary appendage to a Republican system. Where universal suffrage obtains it is obvious that the government is in the hands of a numerical majority; and it is hardly necessary to say that in every part of the world more than half the people are ignorant and poor. Though no one can look upon poverty as a crime, and we do not generally here regard it as any objection to a man in his individual capacity, still it must be admitted that it is a wretched and insecure government which is administered by its most ignorant citizens, and those who have the least at stake under it. Though intelligence and wealth have great influence here as everywhere in keeping in check reckless and unenlightened numbers, yet it is evident to close observers, if not to all, that these are rapidly usurping all power in the non-slave-holding States, and threaten a fearful crisis in Republican Institutions there at no remote period. In the slave-holding States, however, nearly one-half of the whole population and those the poorest and most ignorant, have no political influence whatever, because they are slaves. Of the other half a large proportion are both educated and independent in their circumstances, while those who unfortunately are not so, being still elevated far above the mass, are higher toned and more deeply interested in preserving a stable and well ordered Government, than the same class in any other country. Hence, slavery is truly the "corner stone" and foundation of every well-designed and durable "Republican edifice."

With us every citizen is concerned in the maintainance of order, and in promoting honesty and industry among those of the lowest class who are our slaves; and our habitual vigilance renders standing armies, whether of Soldiers or Policemen, entirely unnecessary. Small guards in our cities, and occasional patrols in the country, ensure us a repose and security known no where else. You cannot be ignorant that, excepting the United States, there is no country in the world whose existing Government would not be overturned in a month, but for its standing armies, maintained at an enormous and destructive cost to those whom they are destined to over-awe—so rampant and combative is the spirit of discontent wherever nominal Free labor prevails, with its ostensive privileges and its dismal servitude. Nor will it be long before the "*Free States*" of this Union will be compelled to introduce the same expensive machinery to preserve order among their "free and equal" citizens. Already has Philadelphia organized a permanent Battalion for this purpose: New-York, Boston and Cincinnati will soon follow her example; and then the smaller towns and densely populated counties. The intervention of their militia to repress violations of the peace is becoming a daily affair. A strong Government, after some of the old fashions—though probably with a new name—sustained by the force of armed mercenaries, is the ultimate destiny of the non-slave-holding section of this confederacy, and one which may not be very distant.

It is a great mistake to suppose, as is generally done abroad, that in case of war slavery would be a source of weakness. It did not weaken Rome, nor Athens, nor Sparta. though their slaves were comparatively far more numerous than ours, of the same color for the most part with themselves, and large numbers of them familiar with the use of arms. I have no apprehension that our slaves would seize such an opportunity to revolt. The present generation of them, born among us, would never think of such a thing at any time, unless instigated to it by others. Against such instigations we are always on our guard. In time of war we should be more watchful and better prepared to put down insurrections than at any other periods. Should any foreign nation be so lost to every sentiment of civilized humanity as to attempt to erect among us the standard of revolt, or to invade us with Black Troops for the base and barbarous purpose of stirring up servile war, their efforts would be signally rebuked. Our slaves could not be easily seduced, nor would any thing delight them more than to assist in stripping Cuffee of his regimentals to put him in the Cotton-field, which would be the fate of most black invaders, without any very prolix form of "apprenticeship." If, as I am satisfied would be the case, our slaves remained peacefully on our plantations, and cultivated them in time of war under the surperintendance of a limited number of our citizens, it is obvious that we could put forth

more strength in such an emergency, at less sacrifice, than any other people of the same numbers. And thus we should in every point of view, "out of this nettle danger, pluck the flower safety."

How far slavery may be an advantage or disadvantage to those not owning slaves, yet united with us in political association, is a question for their sole consideration. It is true that our Representation in Congress is increased by it. But so are our Taxes; and the non-slave-holding States being the majority divide among themselves far the greater portion of the amount levied by the Federal Government. And I doubt not that when it comes to a close calculation they will not be slow in finding out that the balance of profit arising from the connection is vastly in their favor.

In a social point of view the Abolitionists pronounce slavery to be a monstrous evil. If it was so, it would be our own peculiar concern, and superfluous benevolence in them to lament over it. Seeing their bitter hostility to us, they might leave us to cope with our own calamities. But they make war upon us out of excess of charity, and attempt to purify by covering us with calumny. You have read and assisted to circulate a great deal about affrays, duels and murders occuring here, and all attributed to the terrible demoralization of slavery. Not a single event of this sort takes place among us, but it is caught up by the Abolitionists and paraded over the world with endless comments, variations and exaggerations. You should not take what reaches you as a mere sample, and infer that there is a vast deal more you never hear. You hear all, and more than all, the truth.

It is true that the point of honor is recognized throughout the slave region, and that disputes of certain classes are frequently referred for adjustment to the "trial by combat." It would not be appropriate for me to enter, in this letter, into a defence of the practice of duelling, nor to maintain at length that it does not tarnish the character of a people to acknowledge a standard of honor. Whatever evils may arise from it, however, they cannot be attributed to slavery, since the same custom prevails both in France and England. Few of your Prime Ministers, of the last half century even, have escaped the contagion, I believe. The affrays, of which so much is said, and in which rifles, bowie-knives and pistols are so prominent, occur mostly in the Frontier States of the South-West. They are naturally incidental to the condition of society as it exists in many sections of these recently settled countries, and will as naturally cease in due time. Adventurers from the older States and from Europe, as desperate in character as they are in fortune, congregate in these wild regions, jostling one another and often forcing the peaceable and honest into rencontres in self-defence. Slavery has nothing to do with these things. Stability and peace are the first desires of every slave-holder, and the true tendency of the system. It could

not possibly exist amid the eternal anarchy and civil broils of the ancient Spanish dominions in America. And for this very reason, domestic slavery has ceased there. So far from encouraging strife, such scenes of riot and bloodshed as have within the last few years disgraced our Northern cities, and as you have lately witnessed in Birmingham and Bristol and Wales, not only never have occurred, but I will venture to say never will occur in our slave-holding States. The only thing that can create a mob (as you might call it) here, is the appearance of an Abolitionist whom the people assemble to chastise. And this is no more of a mob, than a rally of shepherds to chase a wolf out of their pastures would be one.

But we are swindlers and repudiators! Pennsylvania is not a slave State. A majority of the States which have failed to meet their obligations punctually are non-slave-holding; and two-thirds of the debt said to be repudiated is owed by these States. Many of the States of this Union are heavily encumbered with debt—none so hopelessly as England. Pennsylvania owes $22 for each inhabitant—England $222, counting her paupers in. Nor has there been any repudiation definite and final, of a lawful debt, that I am aware of. A few States have failed to pay some instalments of interest. The extraordinary financial difficulties which occurred a few years ago account for it. Time will set all things right again. Every dollar of both principal and interest owed by any State, North or South, will be ultimately paid, *unless the abolition of slavery overwhelms us all in one common ruin.* But have no other nations failed to pay? When were the French Assignats redeemed? How much interest did your National Bank pay on its immense circulation from 1797 to 1821, during which period that circulation was inconvertible, and for the time *repudiated?* How much of your National Debt has been incurred for money borrowed to meet the interest on it, thus avoiding delinquency in detail, by insuring inevitable bankruptcy and repudiation in the end? And what sort of operation was that by which your present Ministry recently expunged a handsome amount of that debt by substituting, through a process just not compulsory, one species of security for another? I am well aware that the faults of others do not excuse our own, but when failings are charged to slavery, which are shown to occur to equal extent where it does not exist, surely slavery must be acquitted of the accusation.

It is roundly asserted, that we are not so well educated nor so religious here as elsewhere. I will not go into tedious statistical statements on these subjects. Nor have I, to tell the truth, much confidence in the details of what are commonly set forth as statistics. As to education, you will probably admit that slave-holders should have more leisure for mental culture than most people. And I believe it is charged against them that they are peculiarly fond of power, and ambitious of honors. If this be so, as all the power and honors of this

country are won mainly by intellectual superiority it might be fairly presumed that slave-holders would not be neglectful of education. In proof of the accuracy of this presumption I point you to the facts, that our Presidential chair has been occupied for forty-four out of fifty-six years by slave-holders; that another has been recently elected to fill it for four more, over an opponent who was a slave-holder also; and that in the Federal offices and both Houses of Congress considerably more than a due proportion of those acknowledged to stand in the first rank are from the South. In this arena the intellects of the free and slave States meet in full and fair competition. Nature must have been unusually bountiful to us, or we have been at least reasonably assiduous in the cultivation of such gifts as she has bestowed—unless indeed you refer our superiority to moral qualities, which I am sure *you* will not. More wealthy we are not; nor would mere wealth avail in such rivalry.

The piety of the South is unobtrusive. We think it proves but little, though it is a confident thing for a man to claim that he stands higher in the estimation of his Creator, and is less a sinner, than his neighbor. If vociferation is to carry the question of religion, the North and probably the Scotch have it. Our sects are few, harmonious, pretty much united among themselves, and pursue their avocations in humble peace. In fact, our professors of Religion seem to think—whether correctly or not—that it is their duty "to do good in secret" and to carry their holy comforts to the heart of each individual, without reference to class *or color*, for his special enjoyment, and not with a view to exhibit their zeal before the world. So far as numbers are concerned, I believe our clergymen, when called on to make a showing, have never had occasion to blush, if comparisons were drawn between the free and slave States. And although our presses do not teem with controversial pamphlets, nor our pulpits shake with excommunicating thunders, the daily walk of our religious communicants furnishes apparently as little food for gossip as is to be found in most other regions. It may be regarded as a mark of our want of excitability—though that is a quality accredited to us in an eminent degree—that few of the remarkable religious *Isms* of the present day have taken root among us. We have been so irreverent as to laugh at Mormonism and Millerism, which have created such commotions farther North; and modern Prophets have no honor in our country. Shakers, Rappists, Dunkers, Socialists, Fourrierists and the like keep themselves afar off. Even Puseyism has not yet moved us. You may attribute this to our Domestic Slavery if you choose. I believe you would do so justly. There is no material here for such characters to operate upon.

But your grand charge is that licentiousness in intercourse between th sexes is a prominent trait of our social system, and that it necessarily arises from slavery. This is a favorite theme with the Abolitionists, male and fe-

male. Folios have been written on it. It is a common observation, that there is no subject on which ladies of eminent virtue so much delight to dwell, and on which in especial learned old maids like Miss Martineau linger with such an insatiable relish. They expose it in the Slave States with the most minute observance and endless iteration. Miss Martineau, with peculiar gust, relates a series of scandalous stories which would have made Boccacio jealous of her pen, but which are so ridiculously false as to leave no doubt that some wicked wag, knowing she would write a book, has furnished her materials—a game too often played on Tourists in this country. The constant recurrence of the female Abolitionists to this topic, and their bitterness in regard to it, cannot fail to suggest to even the most charitable mind, that

"Such rage without betrays the fires within."

Nor are their immaculate coadjutors of the other sex, though perhaps less specific in their charges, less violent in their denunciations. But recently in your Island a clergyman has, at a public meeting, stigmatized the whole Slave region as a "Brothel." Do these people thus cast stones being "without sin"? Or do they only

"Compound for sins they are inclined to
By damning those they have no mind to."

Alas that David and Solomon should be allowed to repose in peace—that Leo should be almost canonized, and Luther more than sainted—that in our own day courtezans should be formally licensed in Paris, and tenements in London rented for years to women of the town for the benefit of the Church, with the knowledge of the Bishop—and the poor Slave States of America alone pounced upon and offered up as a holocaust on the Altar of Immaculateness to atone for the abuse of natural instinct by all mankind; and if not actually consumed, at least exposed, anathematized and held up to scorn, by those who

"write
Or with a Rival's or an Eunuch's spite."

But I do not intend to admit that this charge is just or true. Without meaning to profess uncommon modesty, I will say that I wish the topic could be avoided. I am of opinion, and I doubt not every right-minded man will concur, that the public exposure and discussion of this vice, even to rebuke, invariably does more harm than good; and that if it cannot be checked by instilling pure and virtuous sentiments, it is far worse than useless to attempt to do it, by exhibiting its deformities. I may not, however, pass it over; nor ought I to feel any delicacy in examining a question to which the Slave-holder is invited and challenged by Clergymen and Virgins. So far from allowing, then, that licentiousness pervades this region, I broadly assert, and I refer to the records of our Courts, to the public press, and to the knowledge of all

who have ever lived here, that among our white population, there are fewer cases of divorce, separation, crim con, seduction, rape and bastardy, than among any other five millions of people on the civilized earth. And this fact I believe will be conceded by the Abolitionists of this country themselves. I am almost willing to refer it to them and submit to their decision on it. I would not hesitate to do so if I thought them capable of an impartial judgment on any matter where Slavery is in question. But it is said that the licentiousness consists in the constant intercourse between white males and colored females. One of your heavy charges against us has been that we regard and treat these people as brutes; you now charge us with habitually taking them to our bosoms. I will not comment on the inconsistency of these accusations. I will not deny that some intercourse of the sort does take place. Its character and extent, however, are grossly and atrociously exaggerated. No authority divine or human has yet been found sufficient to arrest all such irregularities among men. But it is a known fact, that they are perpetrated here, for the most part, in the cities. Very few mulattoes are reared on our plantations. In the cities a large proportion of the inhabitants do not own slaves. A still larger proportion are natives of the North or foreigners. They should share, and justly, too, an equal part in this sin with the Slave-holders. Facts cannot be ascertained, or I doubt not it would appear that they are the chief offenders. If the truth be otherwise, then persons from abroad have stronger prejudices against the African race than we have. Be this as it may, it is well known that this intercourse is regarded in our society as highly disreputable. If carried on habitually it seriously affects a man's standing, so far as it is known; and he who takes a colored mistress—with rare and extraordinary exceptions—loses caste at once. You will say that *one* exception should damn our whole country. How much less criminal is it to take a white mistress? In your eyes it should be at least an equal offence. Yet look around you at home, from the cottage to the throne, and count how many mistresses are kept in unblushing notoriety, without any loss of caste. Such cases are almost unknown here, and down even to the lowest walks of life it is almost invariably fatal to a man's position and prospects to keep a mistress openly, whether white or black. What Miss Martineau relates of a young man's purchasing a colored concubine from a lady and avowing his designs, is too absurd even for contradiction. No person would dare to allude to such a subject in such a manner to any decent female in this country. If he did, he would be *lynched*—doubtless with your approbation.

After all, however, the number of the mixed breed in proportion to that of the black is infinitely small, and out of the towns next to nothing. And when it is considered that the African race has been among us for two hundred years,

and that those of the mixed breed continually intermarry—often rearing large families—it is a decided proof of our continence that so few comparatively are to be found. Our misfortunes are two-fold. From the prolific propagation of these mongrels among themselves, we are liable to be charged by tourists with delinquencies where none have been committed, while, where one has been, it cannot be concealed. Color marks indelibly the offence, and reveals it to every eye. Conceive that, even in your virtuous and polished country, if every bastard through all the circles of your social system was thus branded by nature and known to all, what shocking developments might there not be! How little indignation might your saints have to spare for the licentiousness of the slave region. But I have done with this disgusting topic. And I think I may justly conclude, after all the scandalous charges which tea-table gossip and long-gowned hypocrisy have brought against the slave-holders, that a people whose men are proverbially brave, intellectual and hospitable, and whose women are unaffectedly chaste, devoted to domestic life and happy in it, can neither be degraded nor demoralized, whatever their institutions may be. My decided opinion is, that our system of Slavery contributes largely to the developement and culture of these high and noble qualities.

In an economical point of view—which I will not omit—Slavery presents some difficulties. As a general rule, I agree it must be admitted, that free labor is cheaper than Slave labor. It is a fallacy to suppose that ours is *unpaid labor*. The slave himself must be paid for, and thus his labor is all purchased at once, and for no trifling sum. His price was in the first place paid mostly to your countrymen, and assisted in building up some of those colossal English fortunes since illustrated by patents of nobility, and splendid piles of architecture, stained and cemented, if you like the expression, with the blood of kidnapped innocents; but loaded with no heavier curses than Abolition and its begotten fanaticisms have brought upon your land—some of them fulfilled, some yet to be. But besides the first cost of the slave, he must be fed and clothed—well fed and well clothed, if not for humanity's sake, that he may do good work, retain health and life, and rear a family to supply his place. When old or sick he is a clear expense, and so is the helpless portion of his family. No poor law provides for him when unable to work, or brings up his children for our service when we need them. These are all heavy charges on slave labor. Hence, in all countries where the denseness of the population has reduced it to a matter of perfect certainty that labor can be obtained whenever wanted, and the laborer be forced by sheer necessity to hire for the smallest pittance that will keep soul and body together and rags upon his back while in actual employment—dependent at all other times on alms or poor rates—in all such countries it is found cheaper to pay this pittance than to clothe, feed, nurse, support through childhood and pension in old age a race of

slaves. Indeed, the advantage is so great as speedily to compensate for the loss of the value of the slave. And I have no hesitation in saying that if I could cultivate my lands on these terms I would without a word resign my slaves, provided they could be properly disposed of. But the question is, whether free or slave labor is cheapest to us in this country at this time, situated as we are. And it is decided at once by the fact that we cannot avail ourselves of any other than slave labor. We neither have nor can we procure other labor to any extent, or on anything like the terms mentioned. We must therefore content ourselves with our dear labor, under the consoling reflection that what is lost to us, is gained to humanity; and that inasmuch as our slave costs us more than your free man costs you, by so much is he better off. You will promptly say, emancipate your slaves, and then you will have free labor on suitable terms. That might be if there were five hundred where there now is one, and the continent, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, was as densely populated as your Island. But until that comes to pass no labor can be procured in America on the terms you have it.

While I thus freely admit that to the individual proprietor slave labor is dearer than free, I do not mean to admit it as equally clear that it is dearer to the community and to the State. Though it is certain that the slave is a far greater consumer than your laborer the year round, yet your pauper system is costly and wasteful. Supported by your community at large, it is not administered by your hired agents with that interested care and economy—not to speak of humanity—which mark the management of ours by each proprietor for his own non-effectives; and is both more expensive to those who pay, and less beneficial to those who receive its bounties. Besides this, Slavery is rapidly filling up our country with a hardy and healthy race peculiarly adapted to our climate and productions, and conferring signal political and social advantages on us as a people to which I have already referred.

I have yet to reply to the main ground on which you and your coadjutors rely for the overthrow of our system of slavery. Failing in all your attempts to prove that it is sinful in its nature, immoral in its effects, a political evil, and profitless to those who maintain it, you appeal to the sympathies of mankind, and attempt to arouse the world against us by the most shocking charges of tyranny and cruelty. You begin by a vehement denunciation of "the irresponsible power of one man over his fellow men." The question of the responsibility of power is a vast one. It is the great political question of modern times. Whole nations divide off upon it and establish different fundamental systems of government. That "responsibility," which to one set of millions seems amply sufficient to check the government to the support of which they devote their lives and fortunes, appears to another set of millions a mere mockery of restraint. And accordingly as the opinions

of these millions differ, they honor each other with the epithets of "Serfs" or "Anarchists." It is ridiculous to introduce such an idea as this into the discussion of a mere Domestic Institution. But since you have introduced it, I deny that the power of the slave-holder in America is "irresponsible." He is responsible to God. He is responsible to the world—a responsibility which Abolitionists do not intend to allow him to evade—and in acknowledgment of which I write you this letter. He is responsible to the community in which he lives, and to the laws under which he enjoys his civil rights. Those laws do not permit him to kill, to maim, or to punish beyond certain limits, or to overtask, or to refuse to feed and clothe his slave. In short, they forbid him to be tyrannical or cruel. If any of these laws have grown obsolete, it is because they are so seldom violated that they are forgotten. You have disinterred one of them from a compilation by some Judge STROUD of Philadelphia, to stigmatize its inadequate penalties for killing, maiming, &c. Your object appears to be—you can have no other—to produce the impression that it must be often violated on account of its insufficiency. You say as much, and that it marks our estimate of the slave. You forget to state that this law was enacted by *Englishmen*, and only indicates *their* opinion of the reparation due for these offences. Ours is proved by the fact, though perhaps unknown to Judge STROUD or yourself, that we have essentially altered this law; and the murder of a slave has for many years been punishable with death in this State. And so it is, I believe, in most or all the slave States. You seem well aware, however, that laws have been recently passed in all these States making it penal to teach slaves to read. Do you know what occasioned their passage, and renders their stringent enforcement necessary? I can tell you. It was the Abolition agitation. If the slave is not allowed to read his Bible, the sin rests upon the Abolitionists; for they stand prepared to furnish him with a Key to it, which would make it, not a Book of hope and love and peace, but of despair, hatred and blood; which would convert the reader, not into a Christian, but a Demon. To preserve him from such a horrid destiny, it is a sacred duty which we owe to our slaves, not less than to ourselves, to interpose the most decisive means. If the Catholics deem it wrong to trust the Bible to the hands of ignorance, shall we be excommunicated because we will not give it, and with it the corrupt and fatal commentaries of the Abolitionists, to our slaves? Allow our slaves to read your pamphlets, stimulating them to cut our throats! Can you believe us to be such unspeakable fools?

I do not know that I can subscribe in full to the sentiment so often quoted by the Abolitionists, and by Mr. DICKINSON in his letter to me: "*Homo sum et nihil humanum a me alienum puto*," as translated and practically illustrated by them. Such a doctrine would give wide authority to every one for the

most dangerous intermeddling with the affairs of others. It will do in poetry—perhaps in some sorts of Philosophy—but the attempt to make it a household maxim, and introduce it into the daily walks of life, has caused many an "Homo" a broken crown; and probably will continue to do it. Still, though a slave-holder, I freely acknowledge my obligations as a man; and that I am bound to treat humanely the fellow creatures whom God has entrusted to my charge. I feel therefore somewhat sensitive under the accusation of cruelty, and disposed to defend myself and fellow slave-holders against it. It is certainly the interest of all, and I am convinced that it is also the desire of every one of us, to treat our slaves with proper kindness. It is necessary to our deriving the greatest amount of profit from them. Of this we are all satisfied. And you snatch from us the only consolation we Americans could derive from the opprobious imputation of being wholly devoted to making money, which your disinterested and gold-despising countrymen delight to cast upon us, when you nevertheless declare that we are ready to sacrifice it for the pleasure of being inhuman. You remember that Mr. Pitt could never get over the idea that self-interest would insure kind treatment to slaves, until you told him your woful stories of the Middle Passage. Mr. Pitt was right in the first instance, and erred, under your tuition, in not perceiving the difference between a temporary and permanent ownership of them. Slave-holders are no more perfect than other men. They have passions. Some of them, as you may suppose, do not at all times restrain them. Neither do husbands, parents and friends. And in each of these relations as serious sufferings as frequently arise from uncontrolled passions as ever does in that of Master and Slave, and with as little chance of indemnity. Yet you would not on that account break them up. I have no hesitation in saying that our slave-holders are as kind masters, as men usually are kind husbands, parents and friends—as a general rule, kinder. A bad master—he who overworks his slaves, provides ill for them, or treats them with undue severity—loses the esteem and respect of his fellow citizens to as great an extent as he would for the violation of any of his social and most of his moral obligations. What the most perfect plan of management would be is a problem hard to solve. From the commencement of Slavery in this country, this subject has occupied the minds of all slave-holders, as much as the improvement of the general condition of mankind has those of the most ardent Philanthropists; and the greatest progressive amelioration of the system has been effected. You yourself acknowledge that in the early part of your career you were exceedingly anxious for the *immediate* abolition of the Slave Trade, lest those engaged in it should so mitigate its evils as to destroy the force of your arguments and facts. The improvement you then *dreaded* has gone on steadily here, and would doubtless have taken place in the Slave Trade but for the measures adopted to suppress it.

Of late years we have been not only annoyed, but greatly embarrassed in this matter, by the Abolitionists. We have been compelled to curtail some privileges; we have been debarred from granting new ones. In the face of discussions which aim at loosening all ties between master and slave, we have in some measure to abandon our efforts to attach them to us and control them through their affections and pride. We have to rely more and more on the power of fear. We must in all our intercourse with them assert and maintain strict mastery, and impress it on them that they are Slaves. This is painful to us, and certainly no present advantage to them. But it is the direct consequence of the Abolition agitation. We are determined to continue Masters, and to do so we have to draw the rein tighter and tighter day by day to be assured that we hold them in complete check. How far this process will go on depends wholly and solely on the Abolitionists. When they desist we can relax. We may not before. I do not mean by all this to say that we are in a state of actual alarm and fear of our slaves; but under existing circumstances we should be ineffably stupid not to increase our vigilance and strengthen our hands. You see some of the fruits of your labors. I speak freely and candidly—not as a colonist who, though a slaveholder has a master; but as a free white man, holding, under God, and resolved to hold, my fate in my own hands; and I assure you that my sentiments and feelings and determinations are those of every slaveholder in this country.

The research and ingenuity of the Abolitionists, aided by the invention of runaway slaves—in which faculty, so far as improvising falsehood goes, the African Race is without a rival—have succeeded in shocking the world with a small number of pretended intances of our barbarity. The only wonder is that, considering the extent of our country, the variety of our population, its fluctuating character, and the publicity of all our transactions, the number of cases collected is so small. It speaks well for us. Yet of these many are false, all highly colored, some occurring half a century, most of them many years, ago; and no doubt a large proportion of them perpetrated by foreigners. With a few rare exceptions the emigrant Scotch and English are the worst masters among us, and next to them our Northern fellow-citizens. Slaveholders born and bred here are always more humane to slaves, and those who have grown up to a large inheritance of them, the most so of any—showing clearly that the effect of the system is to foster kindly feelings. I do not mean so much to impute innate inhumanity to foreigners, as to show that that they come here with false notions of the treatment usual and necessary for slaves, and that newly acquired power here, as every where else, is apt to be abused. I cannot enter into a detailed examination of the cases stated by the Abolitionists. It would be disgusting and of little avail. I know nothing of them. I have seen nothing like them, though born and

bred here, and have rarely heard of anything at all to be compared with them. Permit me to say that I think most of *your* facts must have been drawn from the West Indies, where undoubtedly slaves were treated much more harshly than with us. This was owing to a variety of causes, which might, if necessary, be stated. One was that they had at first to deal more extensively with barbarians fresh from the wilds of Africa; another, and a leading one, the absenteeism of Proprietors. Agents are always more unfeeling than owners, whether placed over West Indian or American slaves, or Irish Tenantry. We feel this evil greatly even here. You describe the use of *thumb screws* as one mode of punishment among us. I doubt if a thumb screw can be found in America. I never saw or heard of one in this country. Stocks are rarely used by private individuals, and confinement still more seldom, though both are common punishments for whites, all the world over. I think they should be more frequently resorted to with slaves, as substitutes for flogging, which I consider the most injurious and least efficacious mode of punishing them for serious offences. It is not degrading, and unless excessive occasions little pain. You may be a little astonished, after all the flourishes that have been made about "cart whips," &c., when I say flogging is not the most degrading punishment in the world. It may be so to a white man in most countries, but how is it to the white boy? That necessary coadjutor of the school-master the "birch" is never thought to have rendered infamous the unfortunate victim of pedagogue ire; nor did Solomon in his wisdom dream that he was counseling parents to debase their offspring, when he exhorted them not to spoil the child by sparing the rod. Pardon me for recurring to the now exploded ethics of the Bible. Custom, which, you will perhaps agree, makes most things in this world good or evil, has removed all infamy, from the punishment of the lash to the slave. Your blood boils at the recital of stripes inflicted on a man; and you think you should be frenzied to see your own child flogged. Yet see how completely this is ideal, arising from the fashions of society. You doubtless submitted to the rod yourself, in other years, when the smart was perhaps as severe as it would be now; and you have never been guilty of the folly of revenging yourself on the Preceptor who in the plenitude of his "irresponsible power" thought proper to chastise your son. So it is with the negro, and the negro father.

As to chains and irons, they are rarely used; never I believe except in cases of running away. You must admit that if we pretend to own slaves they must not be permitted to abscond whenever they see fit; and that if nothing else will prevent it these means must be resorted to. See the inhumanity necessarily arising from slavery, you will exclaim. Are such restraints imposed on no other class of people giving no more offence? Look to your army and navy. If your seamen, impressed from their peaceful occupations,

and your soldiers, recruited at the gin shops—both of them as much kidnapped as the most unsuspecting victim of the Slave Trade, and doomed to a far more wretched fate—if these men manifest a propensity to desert, the heaviest manacles are their mildest punishment: It is most commonly death, after summary trial. But armies and navies you say are indispensable, and must be kept up at every sacrifice. I answer that they are no more indispensable than slavery is to us—and to *you*; for you have enough of it in your country, though the form and name differ from ours.

Depend upon it that many things, and in regard to our slaves, most things which appear revolting at a distance, and to slight reflection, would on a nearer view and impartial comparison with the customs and conduct of the rest of mankind, strike you in a very different light. Remember that on our estates we dispense with the whole machinery of public police and public Courts of Justice. Thus we try, decide and execute the sentences, in thousands of cases, which in other countries would go into the Courts. Hence, most of the acts of our alleged cruelty, which have any foundation in truth. Whether our Patriarchal mode of administering justice is less humane than the Assizes can only be determined by careful inquiry and comparison. But this is never done by the Abolitionists. All our punishments are the outrages of "irresponsible power." If a man steals a pig in England he is transported—torn from wife, children, parents, and sent to the Antipodes, infamous, and an outcast forever, though perhaps he took from the superabundance of his neighbor to save the lives of his famishing little ones. If one of our well fed negroes, merely for the sake of fresh meat, steals a pig, he gets perhaps forty stripes. If one of your Cottagers breaks into another's house, he is hung for burglary. If a slave does the same here, a few lashes, or perhaps a few hours in the stocks, settles the matter. Are our Courts or yours the most humane? If slavery were not in question you would doubtless say ours is mistaken lenity. Perhaps it often is; and slaves too lightly dealt with sometimes grow daring. Occasionally, though rarely, and almost always in consequence of excessive indulgence, an individual rebels. This is the highest crime he can commit. It is treason. It strikes at the root of our whole system. His life is justly forfeited, though it is never intentionally taken, unless after trial in our Public Courts. Sometimes, however, in capturing, or in self-defence, he is unfortunately killed. A legal investigation always follows. But, terminate as it may, the Abolitionists raise a hue and cry, and another "shocking case" is held up to the indignation of the world by tender-hearted male and female Philanthropists, who would have thought all right had the master's throat been cut, and would have triumphed in it.

I cannot go into a detailed comparison between the penalties inflicted on a slave in our Patriarchal Courts, and those of the Courts of Sessions to which

freemen are sentenced in all civilized nations; but I know well that if there is any fault in our criminal code, it is that of excessive mildness.

Perhaps a few general facts will best illustrate the treatment this race receives at our hands. It is acknowledged that it increases at least as rapidly as the white. I believe it is an established principle, that population thrives in proportion to its comforts. But when it is considered that these people are not recruited by immigration from abroad as the whites are, and that they are usually settled on our richest and least healthy lands, the fact of their equal comparative increase and greater longevity, outweighs a thousand Abolition falsehoods, in favor of the leniency and providence of our management of them. It is also admitted that there are incomparably fewer cases of insanity and suicide among them than among the whites. The fact is, that among the slaves of the African race these things are almost wholly unknown. However frequent suicide may have been among those brought from Africa, I can say that in my time I cannot remember to have known or heard of a single instance of deliberate self-destruction, and but of one of suicide at all. As to insanity, I have seen but one permanent case of it, and that twenty years ago. It cannot be doubted that among three millions of people there must be some insane and some suicides; but I will venture to say that more cases of both occur annually among every hundred thousand of the population of Great Britain than among all our slaves. Can it be possible, then, that they exist in that state of abject misery, goaded by constant injuries, outraged in their affections and worn down with hardships, which the Abolitionists depict, and so many ignorant and thoughtless persons religiously believe?

With regard to the separation of husbands and wives, parents and children, nothing can be more untrue than the inferences drawn from what is so constantly harped on by Abolitionists. Some painful instances perhaps may occur. Very few that can be prevented. It is and it always has been an object of prime consideration with our slaveholders to keep families together. Negroes are themselves both perverse and comparatively indifferent about this matter. It is a singular trait, that they almost invariably prefer forming connexions with slaves belonging to other masters, and at some distance. It is therefore impossible to prevent separations sometimes, by the removal of one owner, his death, or failure, and dispersion of his property. In all such cases, however, every reasonable effort is made to keep the parties together, if they desire it. And the negroes forming these connexions, knowing the chances of their premature dissolution, rarely complain more than we all do of the inevitable strokes of fate. Sometimes it happens that a negro prefers to give up his family rather than separate from his master. I have known such instances. As to willfully selling off a husband or wife or child, I believe it is rarely, very rarely done, except when some offence has been committed de-

manding "transportation." At sales of Estates and even at Sheriffs' sales, they are always, if possible, sold in families. On the whole, notwithstanding the migratory character of our population, I believe there are more families among our slaves, who have lived and died together without losing a single member from their circle, except by the process of nature, and in the enjoyment of constant, uninterrupted communion, than have flourished in the same space of time and among the same number of civilized people in modern times. And to sum up all, if pleasure is correctly defined to be the absence of pain—which so far as the great body of mankind is concerned, is undoubtedly its true definition—I believe our slaves are the happiest three millions of human beings on whom the sun shines. Into their Eden is coming Satan in the guise of an Abolitionist.

As regards their religious condition, it is well known that a majority of the communicants of the Methodist and Baptist churches of the South are colored. Almost everywhere they have precisely the same opportunities of attending worship that the whites have, and besides, special occasions for themselves exclusively, which they prefer. In many places not so accessible to clergymen in ordinary, Missionaries are sent, and mainly supported by their masters, for the particular benefit of the slaves. There are none I imagine who may not, if they like, hear the Gospel preached at least once a month—most of them twice a month, and very many every week. In our thinly settled country the whites fare no better. But in addition to this, on plantations of any size the slaves who have joined the church are formed into a class, at the head of which is placed one of their number, acting as deacon or leader, who is also sometimes a licensed preacher. This class assembles for religious exercises weekly, semi-weekly, or oftener, if the members choose. In some parts also Sunday schools for blacks are established, and Bible classes are orally instructed by discreet and pious persons. Now where will you find a laboring population possessed of greater religious advantages than these? Not in London, I am sure, where it is known that your Churches, Chapels and Religious Meeting Houses, of all sorts, cannot contain one-half of the inhabitants.

I have admitted, without hesitation, what it would be untrue and profitless to deny, that slave-holders are responsible to the world for the humane treatment of the fellow-beings whom God has placed in their hands. I think it would be only fair for you to admit, what is equally undeniable, that every man in independent circumstances, all the world over, and every Government, is to the same extent responsible to the whole human family, for the condition of the poor and laboring classes in their own country and around them, wherever they may be placed, to whom God has denied the advantages he has given themselves. If so, it would naturally seem the duty of true hu-

manity and rational philanthropy to devote their time and labor, their thoughts, writings and charity, first to the objects placed as it were under their own immediate charge. And it must be regarded as a clear evasion and sinful neglect of this cardinal duty, to pass from those whose destitute situation they can plainly see, minutely examine and efficiently relieve, to enquire after the condition of others in no way entrusted to their care, to exaggerate evils of which they cannot be cognizant, to expend all their sympathies and exhaust all their energies on these remote objects of their unnatural, not to say dangerous, benevolence; and finally, to calumniate, denounce and endeavor to excite the indignation of the world against their unoffending fellow-creatures for not hastening under their dictation to redress wrongs which are stoutly and truthfully denied, while they themselves go but little farther in alleviating those chargeable on them than openly and unblushingly to acknowledge them. There may be indeed a sort of merit in doing so much as to make such an acknowledgement, but it must be very modest if it expects appreciation.

Now I affirm that in Great Britain the poor and laboring classes of your own race and color, not only your fellow-beings, but your *fellow-citizens*, are more miserable and degraded, morally and physically, than our slaves; to be elevated to the actual condition of whom, would be to these *your fellow-citizens* a most glorious act of *emancipation*. And I also affirm, that the poor and laboring classes of our older Free States would not be in a much more enviable condition but for our slavery. One of their own Senators has declared in the United States Senate, "that the repeal of the Tariff would reduce New-England to a howling wilderness." And the American Tariff is neither more nor less than a system by which the slave States are plundered for the benefit of those States which do not tolerate slavery.

To prove what I say of Great Britain to be true, I make the following extracts from the Reports of Commissioners appointed by Parliament, and published by order of the House of Commons. I can make but few and short ones. But similar quotations might be made to any extent, and I defy you to deny that these specimens exhibit the real condition of your operatives in every branch of your industry. There is of course a variety in their sufferings. But the same incredible amount of toil, frightful destitution, and utter want of morals, characterize the lot of every class of them.

Collieries. "I wish to call the attention of the Board to the pits about Brampton. The seams are so thin that several of them have only two feet head-way to all the working. They are worked altogether by boys from 8 to 12 years of age, on all-fours, with a dog belt and chain. The passages being neither ironed nor wooded and often an inch or two thick with mud. In Mr. Barnes' pit these poor boys have to drag the barrows with one cwt. of coal or slack 60 times a day 60 yards, and the empty barrows back, without

once straightening their backs, unless they choose to stand under the shaft and run the risk of having their heads broken by a falling coal."—*Rep. on Mines*, 1842, *p.* 71. "In Shropshire the seams are no more than 18 or 20 inches."—*Ibid*, *p.* 67. "At the Booth pit," says Mr. Scriven, "I walked, rode and crept 1800 yards to one of the nearest faces."—*Ibid.* "Choke-damp," Firedamp," "Wild fire," "Sulphur" and "Water" at all times menace instant death to the laborers in these mines." "*Robert North*, aged 16: Went into the pit at 7 years of age, to fill up skips. I drew about 12 months. When I drew by the girdle and chain my skin was broken, and the blood ran down. I durst not say anything. If we said anything the butty, and the reeve, who works under him, would take a stick and beat us."—*Ibid.* "The usual punishment for theft is to place the culprit's head between the legs of one of the biggest boys, and each boy in the pit—sometimes there are 20—inflicts 12 lashes on the back and rump with a cat."—*Ibid.* "Instances occur in which children are taken into these mines to work as early as 4 years of age, sometimes at 5, not unfrequently at 6 and 7, while from 8 to 9 is the ordinary age at which these employments commence."—*Ibid.* The wages paid at these mines is from $2,50 to $7,50 per month for laborers, according to age and ability, and out of this they must support themselves. They work 12 hours a day.—*Ibid.*

In *Calico printing.* "It is by no means uncommon in all the districts for children 5 or 6 years old to be kept at work 14 to 16 hours consecutively."—*Rep. on Children*, 1842, *p.* 59.

I could furnish extracts similar to these in regard to every branch of your Manufactures, but I will not multiply them. Every body knows that your operatives habitually labor from 12 to 16 hours, men, women and children, and the men occasionally 20 hours per day. In lace making, says the last quoted Report, children sometimes commence work at 2 years of age.

Destitution.—It is stated by your Commissioners that 40,000 persons in Liverpool, and 15,000 in Manchester, live in cellars; while 22,000 in England pass the night in barns, tents, or the open air. "There have been found such occurrences as 7, 8 and 10 persons in one cottage, I cannot say for one day, but for whole days, without a morsel of food. They have remained on their beds of straw for two successive days, under the impression that in a recumbent posture the pangs of hunger were less felt." *Lord Brougham's speech, 11th July*, 1842. A volume of frightful scenes might be quoted to corroborate the inferences to be necessarily drawn from the facts here stated. I will not add more, but pass on to the important inquiry as to

Morals and Education.—"*Elizabeth Barrett*, aged 14: I always work without stockings, shoes or trowsers. I wear nothing but a shift. I have to go up to the headings with the men. *They are all naked there.* I am got

used to that." *Report on Mines.* "As to illicit sexual intercourse it seems to prevail universally and from an early period of life." "The evidence might have been doubled which attest the early commencement of sexual and promiscuous intercourse among boys and girls." "A lower condition of morals, in the fullest sense of the term, could not I think be found. I do not mean by this that there are many more prominent vices among them, but that moral feelings and sentiments do not exist. *They have no morals.*" "Their appearance, manners and moral natures—so far as the word *moral* can be applied to them—are in accordance with their half-civilized condition' —*Rep. on Children.* "More than half a dozen instances occurred in Manchester, where a man, his wife and his wife's grown up sister, habitually occupied the same bed."—*Rep. on Sanitary Condition. Robert Cruchilow aged* 16: "I dont know anything of Moses—never heard of France. I I dont know what America is. Never heard of Scotland or Ireland. Cant tell how many weeks there are in a year. There are 12 pence in a shilling, and 20 shillings in a pound. There are eight pints in a gallon of ale."—*Rep. on Mines. Ann Eggly aged* 18: "I walk about and get fresh air on Sundays. I never go to Church or Chapel. I never heard of Christ at all." *Ibid. Others*: "The Lord sent Adam and Eve on earth to save sinners." "I dont know who made the world, I never heard about God." "I dont know Jesus Christ—I never saw him—but I have seen Foster who prays about him." *Employer:* "You have expressed surprise at Thomas Mitchel's not hearing of God. I judge there are few Colliers here about that have." *Ibid.* I will quote no more. It is shocking beyond endurance to turn over your *Records* in which the condition of your laboring classes is but too faithfully depicted. Could our slaves but see it, they would join us in Lynching Abolitionists, which, by the by, they would not now be loth to do. We never think of imposing on them such labor, either in amount or kind. We never put them to *any work* under ten, more generally at twelve years of age, and then the very lightest. Destitution is absolutely unknown—never did a slave starve in America; while in moral sentiments and feelings, in religious information, and even in general intelligence, they are infinitely the superiors of your operatives. When you look around you how dare you talk to us before the world of slavery? For the condition of your wretched laborers, you, and every Briton who is not one of them, are responsible before God and Man. If you are really humane, philanthropic and charitable, here are objects for you. Relieve them. Emancipate them. Raise them from the condition of brutes, to the level of human beings—of American slaves, at least. Do not for an instant suppose that the *name* of being freemen is the slightest comfort to them, situated as they are, or that the bombastic boast that "whoever touches British soil stands redeemed, regenerated

and disenthralled," can meet with anything but the ridicule and contempt of mankind, while that soil swarms, both on and under its surface, with the most abject and degraded wretches that ever bowed beneath the oppressor's yoke.

I have said that slavery is an established and inevitable condition to human society. I do not speak of the *name*, but the *fact*. The Marquis of Normanby has lately declared your operatives to be "*in effect slaves*." Can it be denied? Probably, for such Philanthropists as your Abolitionists care nothing for facts. They deal in terms and fictions. It is the *word* "slavery" which shocks their tender sensibilities; and their imaginations associate it with "hydras and chimeras dire." The thing itself, in its most hideous reality, passes daily under their view unheeded—a familiar face, touching no chord of shame, sympathy or indignation. Yet so brutalizing is your iron bondage that the English operative is a bye word through the world. When favoring fortune enables him to escape his prison house, both in Europe and America he is shunned. With all the skill which 14 hours of daily labor from the tenderest age has ground into him, his discontent, which habit has made second nature, and his depraved propensities, running riot when freed from his wonted fetters, prevent his employment whenever it is not a matter of necessity. If we derived no other benefit from African slavery in the Southern States than that it deterred your *freedmen* from coming hither, I should regard it as an inestimable blessing.

And how unaccountable is that philanthrophy, which closes its eyes upon such a state of things as you have at home, and turns its blurred vision to our affairs beyond the Atlantic, meddling with matters which no way concern them—presiding, as you have lately done, at meetings to denounce the "iniquity of our laws" and "the atrocity of our practices," and to sympathise with infamous wretches imprisoned here for violating decrees promulgated both by God and man. Is this doing the work of "your Father which is in Heaven," or is it seeking only "that you may have glory of man?" Do you remember the denunciation of our Saviour, "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees; Hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess."

But after all, supposing that everything you say of slavery be true, and its abolition a matter of the last necessity, how do you expect to effect emancipation, and what do you calculate will be the result of its accomplishment? As to the means to be used, the Abolitionists, I believe, affect to differ, a large proportion of them pretending that their sole purpose is to apply "moral suasion" to the Slave-holders themselves. As a matter of curiosity, I should like to know what their idea of this "moral suasion" is. Their discourses—yours is no exception—are all tirades, the exordium, argument and perora-

tion, turning on the epithets "tyrants" "thieves," "murderers," addressed to us. They revile us as "atrocious monsters," "violators of the laws of nature, God and man," our homes the abode of every iniquity, our land a "brothel." We retort, that they are "incendiaries" and "assassins." Delightful argument! Sweet, potent "moral suasion!" What slave has it freed —what proselyte can it ever make? But if your course was wholly different— if you distilled nectar from your lips, and discoursed sweetest music, could you reasonably indulge the hope of accomplishing your object by such means? Nay, supposing that we were all convinced, and thought of slavery precisely as you do, at what era of "moral suasion" do you imagine you could prevail on us to give up a thousand millions of dollars in the value of our slaves, and a thousand millions of dollars more in the depreciation of our lands, in consequence of the want of laborers to cultivate them? Consider: were ever any people, civilized or savage persuaded by any argument, Human or Divine, to surrender voluntarily two thousand millions of dollars? Would you think of asking five millions of Englishmen to contribute either at once or gradually four hundred and fifty millions of pounds sterling to the cause of Philanthropy, even if the purpose to be accomplished was not of doubtful goodness? If you are prepared to undertake such a scheme, try it at home. Collect your fund—purchase our slaves, and do with them as you like. Be all the glory yours, fairly and honestly won. But you see the absurdity of such an idea. Away, then, with your pretended "moral suasion." You know it is mere nonsense. The Abolitionists have no faith in it themselves. Those who expect to accomplish anything count on means altogether different. They aim first, to alarm us: that failing, to compel us by force to emancipate our slaves, at our own risk and cost. To these purposes they obviously direct all their energies. Our Northern Liberty men have endeavored to disseminate their destructive doctrines among our slaves, and excite them to insurrection. But we have put an end to that, and stricken terror into them. They dare not show their faces here. Then they declared they would dissolve the Union. Let them do it. The North would repent it far more than the South. We are not alarmed at the idea. We are well content to give up the Union sooner than sacrifice two thousand millions of dollars, and with them all the rights we prize. You may take it for granted that it is impossible to persuade or alarm us into emancipation, or to making the first step towards it. Nothing, then, is left to try, but sheer force. If the Abolitionists are prepared to expend their own treasure and shed their own blood as freely as they ask us to do ours, let them come. We do not court the conflict; but we will not and we cannot shrink from it. If they are not ready to go so far: if, as I expect, their philanthropy recoils from it: if they are looking only for *cheap* glory, let them turn their thoughts elsewhere,

and leave us in peace. Be the sin, the danger and the evils of slavery all our own. We compel, we ask none to share them with us.

I am well aware that a notable scheme has been set on foot to achieve abolition by making what is by courtesy called "free" labor so much cheaper than slave labor as to force the abandonment of the latter. Though we are beginning to *manufacture with slaves*, I do not think you will attempt to pinch your operatives closer in Great Britain. You cannot curtail the rags with which they vainly attempt to cover their nakedness, nor reduce the porridge which barely, and not always, keeps those who have employment from perishing of famine. When you can do this, we will consider whether our slaves may not dispense with a pound or two of bacon per week, or a few garments annually. Your aim, however, is to cheapen labor in the tropics. The idea of doing this by exporting your "bold yeomanry" is I presume given up. Cromwell tried it when he *sold* the captured followers of Charles into *West Indian slavery*, where they speedily found graves. Nor have your recent experiments on British and even Dutch constitutions succeeded better. Have you still faith in carrying thither your Coolies from Hindostan? Doubtless that once wild robber race, whose highest eulogium was that they did not murder merely for the love of blood, have been tamed down, and are perhaps "keen for immigration," for since your civilization has reached it, plunder has grown scarce in Guzerat. But that is the result of the experiment thus far? Have the Coolies, ceasing to handle arms, learned to handle spades, and proved hardy and profitable laborers? On the contrary, broken in spirit and stricken with disease at home, the wretched victims whom you have hitherto kidnapped for a bounty, confined in depots, put under hatches and carried across the ocean—forced into "voluntary immigration," have done little but lie down and die on the *pseudo* soil of freedom. At the end of five years two-thirds, in some colonies a larger proportion, are no more! Humane and pious contrivance! To alleviate the fancied sufferings of the accursed posterity of Ham, you sacrifice by a cruel death two-thirds of the children of the blessed Shem—and demand the applause of Christians—the blessing of Heaven! If this "experiment" is to go on, in God's name try your hand upon the Thugs. That other species of "Immigration" to which you are resorting I will consider presently.

But what do you calculate will be the result of emancipation, by whatever means accomplished? You will probably point me, by way of answer, to the West Indies—doubtless to Antigua, the great boast of abolition. Admitting that it has succeeded there—which I will do for the sake of the argument—do you know the reason of it? The true and only causes of whatever success has attended it in Antigua are, that the population was before crowded, and all or nearly all the arable land in cultivation. The eman-

cipated negroes could not, many of them, get away if they desired; and knew not where to go, in case they did. They had practically no alternative but to remain on the spot; and remaining, they must work on the terms of the Proprietors, or perish—the strong arm of the Mother Country forbidding all hope of seizing the Land for themselves. The Proprietors, well knowing that they could thus command labor for the merest necessities of life, which was much cheaper than maintaining the non-effective as well as effective slaves in a style which decency and interest, if not humanity required, willingly accepted half their value, and at once realized far more than the interest on the other half in the diminution of their expenses, and the reduced comforts of the *freemen*. One of your most illustrious Judges, who was also a profound and philosophical Historian, has said "that Villeinage was not abolished, but went into decay in England." This was the process. This has been the process wherever (the name of) Villeinage or Slavery has been successfully abandoned. Slavery in fact "went into decay" in Antigua. I have admitted that under similar circumstances it might profitably cease here—that is, profitably to the individual Proprietors. Give me half the value of my Slaves, and compel them to remain and labour on my plantation at 10 to 11 cents a day, as they do in Antigua, supporting themselves and families, and you shall have them to-morrow, and if you like dub them "free." Not to stickle, I would surrender them without price. No—I recall my words: My humanity revolts at the idea. I am attached to my Slaves, and would not have art or part in reducing them to such a condition. I deny, however, that Antigua, as a community, is or ever will be *as prosperous* under present circumstances, as she was before abolition, though fully ripe for it. The fact is well known. The reason is that the African, if not a distinct, is an inferior Race, and never will effect, as it never has effected, as much in any other condition as in that of Slavery.

I know of no *Slave-holder* who has visited the West Indies since Slavery was abolished, and published *his* views of it. All our facts and opinions come through the friends of the experiment, or at least those not opposed to it. Taking these, even without allowance, to be true as stated, I do not see where the Abolitionists find cause for exultation. The tables of exports, which are the best evidences of the condition of a people, exhibit a woful falling off—excused, it is true, by unprecedented droughts and hurricanes, to which their free labor seems unaccountably more subject than Slave-labour used to be. I will not go into detail. It is well known that a large proportion of British Legislation and expenditure, and that proportion still constantly increasing, is most anxiously devoted to repairing the monstrous error of emancipation. You are actually galvanizing your expiring Colonies. The truth, deduced from all the facts, was thus pithily stated by the London Quarterly Review, as long

ago as 1840: "None of the benefits anticipated by mistaken good intentions have been realized, while every evil wished for by knaves and foreseen by the wise has been painfully verified. The wild rashness of fanaticism has made the emancipation of the Slaves equivalent to the loss of one half of the West Indies, and yet put back the chance of Negro civilization." (*Art. Ld. Dudley's Letters.*) Such are the *real fruits* of your never-to-be-too-much-glorified abolition, and the valuable dividend of your twenty millions of pounds sterling invested therein.

If any farther proof was wanted of the utter and well known though not yet openly avowed failure of West Indian emancipation, it would be furnished by the startling fact, that THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE HAS BEEN ACTUALLY REVIVED UNDER THE AUSPICES AND PROTECTION OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT. Under the specious guise of "Immigration" they are replenishing those Islands with Slaves from the Coast of Africa. Your colony of Sierra Leone, founded on that coast to prevent the Slave Trade, and peopled by the bye in the first instance by negroes stolen from these States during the Revolutionary War, is the Depot where captives taken from Slavers by your armed vessels are transported. I might say returned, since nearly half the Africans carried across the Atlantic are understood to be embarked in this vicinity. The wretched survivors, who are there set at liberty, are immediately seduced to "immigrate" to the West Indies. The business is systematically carried on by Black "Delegates," sent expressly from the West Indies, where on arrival the "immigrants" are *sold into Slavery* for twenty-one years, under conditions ridiculously trivial and wickedly void, since few or none will ever be able to derive any advantage from them. The whole prime of life thus passed in bondage, it is contemplated, and doubtless it will be carried into effect, to turn them out in their old age to shift for themselves, and to supply their places with fresh and vigorous "Immigrants." Was ever a system of Slavery so barbarous devised before? Can you think of comparing it with ours? Even your own Religious Missionaries at Sierra Leone denounce it "as worse than the Slave state in Africa." And your Black Delegates, fearful of the influence of these Missionaries, as well as on account of the inadequate supply of Captives, are now preparing to procure the able bodied and comparatively industrious Kroomen of the interior, by *purchasing from their Headmen* the privilege of inveigling them to the West India market! Suspends the magnificent farce—perhaps I should say tragedy, of West India Abolition! I will not harrow your feelings by asking you to review the labors of your life and tell me what you and your brother Enthusiasts have accomplished for "injured Africa," but while agreeing with Lord Stowell, that "Villeinage decayed," and admitting that Slavery might do so also, I think I am fully justified by passed and passing events in saying, as Mr. *Crosvenor* said of the Slave Trade, that its *abolition* is "impossible."

You are greatly mistaken, however, if you think that the consequences of emancipation here, would be similar and no more injurious than those which followed from it in your little sea-girt West India Islands, where nearly all were blacks. The system of slavery is not in "decay" with us. It flourishes in full and growing vigor. Our country is boundless in extent. Dotted here and there with villages and fields, it is for the most part covered with immense forests and swamps of almost unknown size. In such a country, with a people so restless as ours, communicating of course some of that spirit to their domestics, can you conceive that anything short of the power of the master over the slave, could confine the African race, notoriously idle and improvident, to labor on our plantations? Break this bond, but for a day, and these plantations will be solitudes. The negro loves change, novelty and sensual excitements of all kinds, *when awake*. "Reason and order," of which Mr. WILBERFORCE said "liberty was the child," do not characterize him. Released from his present obligations his first impulse would be to go somewhere. And here no natural boundaries would restrain him. At first they would all seek the towns, and rapidly accumulate in squalid groups upon their outskirts. Driven thence by the "armed police" which would immediately spring into existence, they would scatter in all directions.—Some bodies of them might wander towards the "free" States, or to the western wilderness, marking their tracks by their depredations and their corpses. Many would roam wild in our "Big woods." Many more would seek the recesses of our swamps for secure covert. Few, very few of them could be prevailed on to do a stroke of work, none to labor continuously, while a head of cattle, sheep or swine could be found in our ranges, or an ear of corn nodded in our abandoned fields. These exhausted, our folds and poultry yards, barns and store-houses would become their prey. Finally, our scattered dwellings would be plundered, perhaps fired and the inmates murdered. How long do you suppose that we could bear these things? How long would it be before we should sleep with rifles at our bedsides, and never move without one in our hands? This work once begun, let the story of our British ancestors and the aborigines of this country tell the sequel. Far more rapid however, would be the catastrophe. "Ere many moons went by," the African race would be exterminated, or reduced again to slavery, their ranks recruited, after your example, by fresh "Emigrants" from their father land.

Is timely preparation and gradual emancipation suggested to avert these horrible consequences? I thought your experience in the West Indies had at least done so much as to explode that idea. If it failed there, much more would it fail here, where the two races, approximating to equality in numbers, are daily and hourly in the closest contact. Give room for but

a single spark of real jealousy to be kindled between them, and the explosion would be instantaneous and universal. It is the most fatal of all fallacies to suppose that these two races can exist together, after any length of time or any process of preparation, on terms at all approaching to equality. Of this, both of them are finally and fixedly convinced. They differ essentially, in all the leading traits which characterize the varieties of the human species, and color draws an indelible and insuperable line of separation between them. Every scheme founded upon the idea that they can remain together on the same soil, beyond the briefest period, in any other relation than precisely that which now subsists between them, is not only preposterous, but fraught with deepest danger. If there was no alternative but to try the "experiment" here, reason and humanity dictate that the sufferings of "gradualism" should be saved and the catastrophe of "immediate abolition," enacted as rapidly as possible. Are you impatient for the performance to commence? Do you long to gloat over the scenes I have suggested, but could not hold the pen to portray? In your long life many such have passed under your review. You know that *they* are not "*impossible*." Can they be to your taste? Do you believe that in laboring to bring them about the Abolitionists are doing the will of God? No! God is not there. It is the work of Satan. The Arch-fiend, under specious guises, has found his way into their souls, and with false appeals to philanthropy, and foul insinuations to ambition, instigates them to rush headlong to the accomplishment of his diabolical designs.

We live in a wonderful age. The events of the last three quarters of a century appear to have revolutionized the human mind. Enterprise and ambition are only limited in their purposes by the horizon of the imagination. It is the transcendental era. In philosophy, religion, government, science, arts, commerce, nothing that has been is to be allowed to be. Conservatism in any form is scoffed at. The slighest taint of it is fatal. Where will all this end? If you can tolerate one ancient maxim let it be that the best criterion of the Future is the Past. That, if anything, will give a clue. And, looking back only through your time, what was the earliest feat of this same Transcendentalism? The rays of the new Moral Drummond Light were first concentrated to a focus at Paris, to illuminate the Universe. In a twinkling it consumed the political, religious, and social systems of France. It could not be extinguished there until literally drowned in blood. And then from its ashes arose that supernatural man, who, for twenty years kept affrighted Europe in convulsions. Since that time its scattered beams, refracted by broader surfaces, have nevertheless continued to scathe wherever they have fallen. What political structure, what religious creed, but has felt the galvanic shock, and even now trembles to its foundations? Mankind, still horror-

stricken by the catastrophe of France, have shrunk from rash experiments upon social systems. But they have been practising in the East, around the Mediterranean, and through the West India Islands. And growing confident, a portion of them seem desperately bent on kindling the all-devouring flame in the bosom of our land. Let it once again blaze up to heaven and another cycle of blood and devastation will dawn upon the world. For our sake, and for the sake of those infatuated men who are madly driving on the conflagration; for the sake of human nature, we are called on to strain every nerve to arrest it. And be assured our efforts will be bounded only with our being. Nor do I doubt that five millions of people, brave, intelligent, united, and prepared to hazard every thing, will, in such a cause, with the blessing of God, sustain themselves. At all events come what may, it is ours to meet it.

We are well aware of the light estimation in which the Abolitionists, and those who are taught by them, profess to hold us. We have seen the attempt of a portion of the Free Church of Scotland to reject our alms, on the ground that we are "Slave-Drivers," after sending missionaries to solicit them. And we have seen Mr. O'Connell, the "irresponsible master" of millions of ragged serfs, from whom, poverty stricken as they are, he contrives to wring a splendid privy purse, throw back with contumely the "tribute" of his own countrymen from this land of "miscreants." These people may exhaust their slang and make black-guards of themselves, but they cannot defile us. And as for the suggestion to exclude slaveholders from your London clubs, we scout it. Many of us, indeed, do go to London, and we have seen your breed of gawky Lords, both there and here, but it never entered into our conceptions to look on them as better than ourselves. Nor can we be annoyed by the ridiculous airs of such upstarts as your O'Connells, Ritchies, Macaulays, and the like. The American slave holders, collectively or individually, ask no favors of any man or race who tread the earth. In none of the attributes of men, mental or physical, do they acknowledge or fear superiority elsewhere. They stand in the broadest light of the knowledge, civilization and improvement of the age, as much favored of Heaven as any of the sons of Adam. Exacting nothing undue, they yield nothing but justice and courtesy, even to royal blood. They can neither be flattered, duped, nor bullied out of their rights or their propriety. They smile with contempt at scurrility and vapouring beyond the seas, and they turn their backs upon it where it is "irresponsible;" but insolence that ventures to look them in the face, will never fail to be chastised.

I think I may trust you will not regard this letter as intrusive. I should never have entertained an idea of writing it, had you not opened the correspondence. If you think anything in it harsh, review your own—which I

regret that I lost soon after it was received—and you will probably find that you have taken your revenge beforehand. If you have not, transfer an equitable share of what you deem severe to the account of the Abolitionists at large. They have accumulated against the slaveholders a balance of invective which, with all our efforts, we shall not be able to liquidate much short of the era in which your National debt will be paid. At all events, I have no desire to offend you personally, and, with the best wishes for your continued health, I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant,

J. H. HAMMOND.

THOS. CLARKSON, ESQ.

SILVER BLUFF, S. C., March 24, 1845.

SIR:—In my letter to you of the 28th January—which I trust you have received ere this—I mentioned that I had lost your circular letter soon after it had come to hand. It was, I am glad to say, only mislaid, and has within a few days been recovered. A second perusal of it induces me to resume my pen. Unwilling to trust my recollections from a single reading, I did not in my last communication attempt to follow the course of your argument, and meet directly the points made and the terms used. I thought it better to take a general view of the subject which could not fail to traverse your most material charges. I am well aware however that, for fear of being tedious, I omitted many interesting topics altogether, and abstained from a complete discussion of some of those introduced. I do not propose now to *exhaust* the subject; which it would require volumes to do; but without waiting to learn—which I may never do—your opinion of what I have already said, I sit down to supply some of the deficiencies of my letter of January, and, with your circular before me, to reply to such parts of it as have not been fully answered.

It is, I perceive, addressed among others to "such as have never visited the Southern States" of this confederacy, and professes to enlighten their ignorance of the actual "condition of the poor slave in their own country." I cannot help thinking you would have displayed prudence in confining the circulation of your letter altogether to such persons. You might then have indulged with impunity in giving, as you have done, a picture of slavery drawn from your own excited imagination, or from those impure fountains, the Martineaus, Marryatts, Trollopes and Dickenses, who have profited by catering, at our expense, to the jealous sensibilities and debauched tastes of your countrymen. Admitting that you are familiar with the history of slavery and the past discussions of it, as I did, I now think rather broadly, in my former let-

ter, what can *you know* of the true *condition* of the "poor slave" here? I am not aware that you have ever visited this country, or even the West Indies. Can you suppose that because you have devoted your life to the investigation of the subject—commencing it under the influence of an enthusiasm so melancholy at first and so volcanic afterwards as to be nothing short of hallucination—pursuing it as men of *one idea* do everything, with the single purpose of establishing your own view of it—gathering your information from discharged seamen, disappointed speculators, factious politicians, visionary reformers and scurrilous tourists—opening your ears to every species of complaint, exaggeration and falsehood that interested ingenuity could invent, and never for a moment questioning the truth of anything that could make for your cause—can you suppose that all this has qualified you, living the while in England, to form or approximate towards the formation of a correct opinion of the condition of slaves among us? I know the power of self-delusion. I have not the least doubt that you think yourself the very best informed man alive on this subject, and that many think so likewise. So far as facts go, even after deducting from your list a great deal that is not fact, I will not deny that probably your collection is the most extensive in existence. But as to the *truth* in regard to slavery, there is not an adult in this region but knows more of it than you do. *Truth* and *fact* are, you are aware, by no means synonimous terms. Ninety-nine facts may constitute a falsehood: the hundredth, added alone, gives the truth. With all your knowledge of facts, I undertake to say that you are entirely and grossly ignorant of the real condition of our slaves. And from all that I can see, you are equally ignorant of the essential principles of human association revealed in history, both sacred and profane, on which slavery rests, and which will perpetuate it forever in some form or other. However you may declaim against it; however powerfully you may array atrocious incidents; whatever appeals you may make to the heated imaginations and tender sensibilities of mankind, believe me, your total blindness to the *whole truth*, which alone constitutes *the truth*, incapacitates you from ever making an impression on the sober reason and sound common sense of the world. You may seduce thousands—you can convince no one. Whenever and wherever you or the advocates of your cause can arouse the passions of the weakminded and the ignorant, and, bringing to bear with them the interests of the vicious and unprincipled, overwhelm common sense and reason—as God sometimes permits to be done—you may triumph. Such a triumph we have witnessed in Great Britain. But I trust it is far distant here: Nor can it from its nature be extensive or enduring. Other classes of Reformers, animated by the same spirit as the Abolitionists, attack the institution of marriage, and even the established relations of Parent and Child. And they collect instances of barbarous cruelty and shock-

ing degradation which rival, if they do not throw into the shade, your slavery statistics. But the rights of marriage and parental authority rest upon truths as obvious as they are unchangeable—coming home to every human being,—self-impressed forever on the individual mind, and cannot be shaken until the whole man is corrupted, nor subverted until civilized society becomes a putrid mass. Domestic slavery is not so universally understood, nor can it make such a direct appeal to individuals or society beyond its pale. Here, prejudice and passion have room to sport at the expense of others. They may be excited and urged to dangerous action, remote from the victims they mark out. They may, as they have done, effect great mischief, but they cannot be made to maintain, in the long run, dominion over reason and common sense, nor ultimately put down what God has ordained.

You deny however that slavery is sanctioned by God, and your chief argument is that when he gave to Adam dominion over the fruits of the earth and the animal creation he stopped there. "He never gave him any further right over his fellow men." You restrict the descendants of Adam to a very short list of rights and powers, duties and responsibilities, if you limit them solely to those conferred and enjoined in the first chapter of Genesis. It is very obvious that in this narrative of the creation Moses did not have it in view to record any part of the Law intended for the government of man in his social or political state. Eve was not yet created; the expulsion had not yet taken place; Cain was unborn; and no allusion whatever is made to the manifold decrees of God to which these events gave rise. The only serious answer this argument deserves is to say, what is so manifestly true, that God's not expressly giving to Adam "any right over his fellow men" by no means excluded Him from conferring that right on his descendants; which he in fact did. We know that Abraham, the chosen one of God, exercised it and held property in his fellow man, even anterior to the period when property in land was acknowledged. We might infer that God had authorised it. But we are not reduced to inference or conjecture. At the hazard of fatiguing you by repetition, I will again refer you to the ordinances of the scriptures. Innumerable instances might be quoted where God has given and commanded men to assume dominion over their fellow men. But one will suffice. In the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus you will find *Domestic Slavery—precisely such as is maintained at this day in these States—ordained and established by God, in language which I defy you to pervert so as to leave a doubt on any honest mind that this institution was founded by Him, and decreed to be perpetual.* I quote the words:

Leviticus, 25 ch. 44 v.: "Both thy Bondmen and thy Bondmaids which thou shalt have, shall be of the Heathen [Africans] that are round about you: of *them ye shall buy Bondmen and Bondmaids.*

45: Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, *and of their families that are with you which they begat in your land* [descendants of Africans?] and they shall be your possession."

46: "*And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession.* THEY SHALL BE YOUR BONDMEN FOREVER."

What human Legislature could make a decree more full and explicit than this? What court of Law or Chancery could defeat a title to a slave couched in terms so clear and complete as these? And this is the *Law of God*, whom you pretend to worship, while you denounce and traduce us for respecting it.

It seems scarcely credible, but the fact is so, that you deny this Law so plainly written, and in the face of it, have the hardihood to declare that "though slavery is not *specifically*, yet it is *virtually forbidden* in the scriptures, because all the crimes which necessarily arise out of slavery, and which can arise from no other source, are reprobated there and threatened with divine vengeance." Such an unworthy subterfuge is scarcely entitled to consideration. But its gross absurdity may be exposed in few words. I do not know what crimes you particularly allude to as arising from slavery. But you will perhaps admit—not because they are denounced in the decalogue, which the Abolitionists respect only so far as they choose, but because it is the *immediate interest* of most men to admit—that disobedience to parents, adultery, and stealing, are crimes. Yet these crimes "necessarily arise from" the relations of parent and child, marriage, and the possession of private property; at least they "can arise from no other sources." Then, according to your argument, it is "virtually forbidden" to marry, to beget children, and to hold private property! Nay it is forbidden to live, since murder can only be perpetrated on living subjects. You add that "in the same way the gladiatorial shows of old, and other barbarous customs, were not specifically forbidden in the New Testament, and yet christianity was the sole means of their suppression." This is very true. But these shows and barbarous customs thus suppressed, were not *authorised by God*. They were not ordained and commanded by God for the benefit of His chosen people and mankind, as the purchase and holding of Bondmen and Bondmaids were. Had they been they would never have been "suppressed by Christianity" any more than slavery can be by your party. Although Christ came "not to destroy but fulfil the Law" he nevertheless did formally abrogate some of the ordinances promulgated by Moses, and all such as were at war with his mission of "peace and good will on earth." He "specifically" annuls, for instance, one "barbarous custom" sanctioned by those ordinances, where he says: "ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you that ye resist not evil, but whosoever shall smite thee on

the right cheek turn to him the other, also." Now, in the time of Christ it was usual for masters to put their slaves to death on the slightest provocation. They even killed and cut them up to feed their fishes. He was undoubtedly aware of these things, as well as of the Law and Commandment I have quoted. He could only have been restrained from denouncing them, as he did the "*lex talionis*," because he knew that in despite of these barbarities the institution of slavery was at the bottom a sound and wholesome as well as lawful one. Certain it is, that in His wisdom and purity he did not see proper to interfere with it. In your wisdom, however, you make the sacrilegious attempt to overthrow it.

You quote the denunciation of Tyre and Sidon, and say that "the chief reason given by the Prophet Joel for their destruction, was, that they were notorious beyond all others for carrying on the Slave Trade." I am afraid you think we have no Bibles in the slave States, or that we are unable to read them. I cannot otherwise account for your making this reference, unless indeed your own reading is confined to an expurgated edition, prepared for the use of Abolitionists, in which everything relating to slavery that militates against their view of it is left out. The Prophet Joel denounces the Tyrians and Sidonians because "The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians." And what is the divine vengeance for this "notorious slave trading?" Hear it. "And I will sell your sons and daughters into the hands of the children of Judah, and they shall sell them to the Sabeans, to a people far off: for the Lord hath spoken it." Do you call this a condemnation of slave-trading? The Prophet makes God Himself a participator in the crime, if that be one. "The Lord hath spoken it," he says, that the Tyrians and Sidonians shall be *sold into slavery* to strangers. Their real offence, was in enslaving the Chosen People; and their sentence was a repetition of the old Command, to make slaves of the "Heathen round about."

I have dwelt upon your scriptural argument because you profess to believe the Bible; because a large proportion of the Abolitionists profess to do the same, and to act under its sanction; because your Circular is addressed in part to "professing Christians;" and because it is from that class mainly that you expect to seduce converts by your anti-christian, I may say, infidel doctrines. It would be wholly unnecessary to answer you to any one who reads the scriptures for himself, and construes them according to any other formula than that which the Abolitionists are wickedly endeavoring to impose upon the world. The scriptural sanction of slavery is in fact so palpable, and so strong, that both wings of your party are beginning to acknowledge it. The more sensible and moderate admit, as the organ of the Free Church of Scotland, the North British Review, has lately done, that they "*are precluded*

by the statements and conduct of the Apostles from regarding mere slave-holding as essentially sinful," while the desperate and reckless, who are bent on keeping up the agitation at every hazard, declare, as has been done in the Anti-Slavery Record, "If our inquiry turns out in favor of slavery, IT IS THE BIBLE THAT MUST FALL, AND NOT THE RIGHTS OF HUMAN NATURE." You cannot, I am satisfied, much longer maintain before the world, the Christian platform from which to wage war upon our Institutions. Driven from it, you must abandon the contest, or, repudiating REVELATION, rush into the horrors of NATURAL RELIGION.

You next complain, that our slaves are kept in bondage by the "Law of force." In what country or condition of mankind do you see human affairs regulated merely by the law of love? Unless I am greatly mistaken you will, if you look over the world, find nearly all certain and permanent rights, civil, social, and I may even add religious, resting on and ultimately secured by the "law of force." The power of majorities—of aristocracies—of Kings—nay of priests, for the most part, and of property, resolves itself at last into "force," and could not otherwise be long maintained. Thus, in every turn of your argument against our system of slavery, you advance, whether conscious of it or not, radical and revolutionary doctrines calculated to change the whole face of the world, to overthrow all government, disorganize society, and reduce man to a state of nature—red with blood, and shrouded once more in barbaric ignorance. But you greatly err, if you suppose, because we rely on force in the last resort to maintain our supremacy over our slaves, that ours is a stern and unfeeling domination at all to be compared in hard-hearted severity to that exercised, not over the mere laborer only, but by the higher over each lower order, wherever the British sway is acknowledged. You say, that if those you address were "to spend one day in the South they would return home with impressions against slavery never to be erased." But the fact is universally the reverse. I have known numerous instances, and I never knew a single one, where there was no other cause of offence and no object to promote by falsehood, that individuals from the non-slave-holding States did not, after residing among us long enough to understand the subject, "return home" *to defend our slavery.* It is matter of regret, that you have never tried the experiment yourself. I do not doubt you would have been converted, for I give you credit for an honest though perverted mind. You would have seen how weak and futile is all abstract reasoning about this matter, and that, as a building may not be less elegant in its proportions, or tasteful in its ornaments, or virtuous in its uses, for being based upon granite, so a system of human government, though founded on force, may develope and cultivate the tenderest and purest sentiments of the human heart. And our patriarchal scheme of domestic

servitude is indeed well calculated to awaken the higher and finer feelings of our nature. It is not wanting in its enthusiasm and its poetry. The relations of the most beloved and honored chief, and the most faithful and admiring subjects, which from the time of Homer have been the theme of song, are frigid and unfelt compared with those existing between the master and his slaves—who served his father, and rocked his cradle, or have been born in his house-hold, and look forward to serve his children—who have been through life the props of his fortune, and the objects of his care—who have partaken of his griefs, and looked to him for comfort in their own—whose sickness he has so often watched over and relieved—whose holidays he has so often made joyous by his bounties and his presence: for whose welfare when absent his anxious solicitude never ceases, and whose hearty and affectionate greetings never fail to welcome him home. In this cold, calculating, ambitious world of ours, there are few ties more heartfelt, or of more benignant influence, than those which mutually bind the master and the slave, under our ancient system, handed down from the Father of Israel. The unholy purpose of the Abolitionists, is to destroy by defiling it; to infuse into it the gall and bitterness which rankle in their own envenomed bosoms; to poison the minds of the master and the servant; turn love to hatred, array "*force*" *against force*, and hurl all,

> "With hideous ruin and combustion, down
> To bottomless perdition."

You think it a great "crime" that we do not pay our slaves "wages," and on this account pronounce us "robbers." In my former letter I showed that the labor of our slaves was not without great cost to us, and that in fact they themselves receive more in return for it than your hirelings do for theirs. For what purpose do men labor, but to support themselves and their families in what comfort they are able? The efforts of mere physical labor seldom suffice to provide more than a livelihood. And it is a well known and shocking fact, that while few operatives in Great Britain succeed in securing a comfortable living, the greater part drag out a miserable existence, and sink at last under absolute want. What avail is it that you go through the form of paying them a pittance of what you call "wages," when you do not, in return for their services, allow them what alone they ask—and have a just right to demand—enough to feed, clothe and lodge them, in health and sickness, with reasonable comfort. Though we do not give "wages" *in money*, we do this for *our slaves*, and they are therefore better rewarded than *yours*. It is the prevailing vice and error of the age, and one from which the Abolitionists, with all their saintly pretensions, are far from being free, to bring everything to the standard of money. You make gold and silver the great test of happiness. The American slave must be wretched indeed, because he is

not compensated for his services *in cash*. It is altogether praiseworthy to pay the laborer a shilling a day and let him starve on it. To supply all his wants abundantly, and at all times, yet withhold from him *money*, is among "the most reprobated crimes." The fact cannot be denied, that the mere laborer is now and always has been, everywhere that barbarism has ceased, enslaved. Among the innovations of modern times following "the decay of villeinage," has been the creation of a new system of slavery. The primitive and patriarchal, which may also be called the sacred and natural system, in which the laborer is under the personal control of a fellow-being endowed with the sentiments and sympathies of humanity, exists among us. It has been almost everywhere else superceded by the modern artificial *money-power system*, in which man—his thews and sinews, his hopes and affections, his very being, are all subjected to the dominion of *Capital*—a monster without a heart—cold, stern, arithmetical—sticking to the bond—taking ever "the pound of flesh"—working up human life with Engines, and retailing it out by weight and measure. His name of old was "Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell from Heaven." And it is to extend his Empire, that you and your deluded coadjutors dedicate your lives. You are stirring up mankind to overthrow our Heaven-ordained system of servitude, surrounded by innumerable checks, designed and planted deep in the human heart by God and nature, to substitute the absolute rule of this "Spirit Reprobate" whose proper place was Hell.

You charge us with looking on our slaves "as chattels or brutes," and enter into a somewhat elaborate argument to prove that they have "human forms," "talk," and even "think." Now the fact is that, however you may indulge in this strain for effect, it is the Abolitionists, and not the Slave-holders, who practically, and in the most important point of view, regard our slaves as "chattels or brutes." In your calculations of the consequences of emancipation you pass over entirely those which must prove most serious, and which arise from the fact of their being *persons*. You appear to think that we might abstain from the use of them as readily as if they were machines to be laid aside, or cattle that might be turned out to find pasturage for themselves. I have heretofore glanced at some of the results that would follow from breaking the bonds of so many *human beings* now peacefully and happily linked into our social system. The tragic horrors, the decay and ruin that would for years, perhaps for ages, brood over our land, if it could be accomplished, I will not attempt to portray. But do you fancy the blight would, in such an event, come to us alone? The diminution of the sugar crop of the West Indies affected Great Britain only, and there chiefly the poor. It was a matter of no moment to Capital, that Labor should have one comfort less. Yet it has forced a reduction of the British duty on sugar.

Who can estimate the consequences that must follow the annihilation of the cotton crop of the slave-holding States? I do not undervalue the importance of other articles of commerce, but no calamity could befall the world at all comparable to the sudden loss of two millions of bales of cotton annually. From the deserts of Africa to the Siberian wilds—from Greenland to the Chinese Wall, there is not a spot of earth but would feel the sensation. The Factories of Europe would fall with a concussion that would shake down castles, palaces and even thrones; while the "purse-proud, elbowing insolence" of our Northern monopolists would disappear forever under the smooth speech of the Pedlar, scouring our frontiers for a livelihood, or the bluff vulgarity of the South sea whaler, following the harpoon amid storms and shoals. Doubtless the Abolitionists think we could grow cotton without slaves, or that at worst the reduction of the crop would be moderate and temporary. Such gross delusions show how profoundly ignorant they are of our condition here.

You declare that "the character of the people of the South has long been that of *hardened Infidels*, who fear not God, and have no regard for religion." I will not repeat what I said in my former letter on this point. I only notice it to ask you how you could possibly reconcile it to your profession of a Christian spirit, to make such a malicious charge—to defile your soul with such a calumny against an unoffending people?

> "You are old;
> Nature in you stands on the very verge
> Of her confine. You should be ruled and led
> By some discretion."—

May God forgive you.

Akin to this is the wanton and furious assault made on us by Mr. Macaulay, in his late speech on the Sugar duties, in the House of Commons, which has just reached me. His denunciations are wholly without measure, and among other things he asserts "that Slavery in the United States wears its worst form; that, boasting of our civilization and freedom, and frequenting Christian Churches, we breed up slaves, nay, beget children for slaves, and sell them at so much a head." Mr. Macaulay is a Reviewer, and he knows that he is "nothing if not critical." The practice of his trade has given him the command of all the slashing and vituperative phrases of our language, and the turn of his mind leads him to the habitual use of them. He is an author, and as no copy-right law secures for him from this country a consideration for his writings, he is not only independent of us, but naturally hates everything American. He is the Representative of Edinburgh: it is his cue to decry our slavery, and in doing so he may safely indulge the malignity of his temper, his indignation against us, and his capacity for railing. He has suffered once, for being in advance of his time in favor of Abolition, and he does not intend that it shall be forgotten, or his claim passed over to any crumb which

may now be thrown to the vociferators in the cause. If he does not know that the statements he has made respecting the slaveholders of this country are vile and atrocious falsehoods, it is because he does not think it worth his while to be sure he speaks the truth, so that he speaks to his own purpose.

"Hic niger est, hunc tu, Romane caveto."

Such exhibitions as he has made may draw the applause of a British House of Commons, but among the sound and high-minded thinkers of the world they can only excite contempt and disgust.

But you are not content with depriving us of all religious feelings. You assert that our slavery has also "demoralized the Northern States," and charge upon it not only every common violation of good order there, but the "Mormon murders," the "Philadelphia riots," and all "the exterminating wars against the Indians." I wonder that you did not increase the list by adding that it had caused the recent inundation of the Mississippi, and the hurricane in the West Indies—perhaps the insurrection of Rebecca, and the war in Scinde. You refer to the law prohibiting the transmission of Abolition petitions through the mail as proof of general corruption! You could not do so, however, without noticing the late detected espionage over the British Post Office by a Minister of State. It is true, as you say, it "occasioned a general outburst of National feeling"—from the opposition; and a "Parliamentary inquiry was instituted"—that is moved, but treated quite cavalierly. At all events, though the fact was admitted, Sir JAMES GRAHAM yet retains the Home Department. For one, I do not undertake to condemn him. Such things are not against the laws and usages of your country. I do not know fully what reasons of State may have influenced him and justified his conduct. But I do know that there is a vast difference in point of "national morality" between the discretionary power residing in your Government to open any letter in the public post office, and a well-defined and limited law to prevent the circulation of certain specified incendiary writings by means of the United States Mail.

Having now referred to everything like argument on the subject of Slavery that is worthy of notice in your letter, permit me to remark on its tone and style, and very extraordinary bearing upon other Institutions of this country. You commence by addressing certain classes of our people as belonging to "a nation whose character is *now so low* in the estimation of the civilized world;" and throughout you maintain this tone. Did the Americans who were "under your roof last summer" inform you that such language would be gratifying to their fellow-citizens "having no practical concern with slaveholding"? Or do the infamous libels on America which you read in our Abolition papers induce you to believe that all that class of people are, like the Abolitionists themselves, totally destitute of patriotism or pride of country? Let me tell

you that you are grossly deceived. And although your stock brokers and other speculators, who have been bitten in American ventures, may have raised a stunning "cry" against us in England, there is a vast body of people here besides slave-holders, who justly

> "Deem their own land of every land the pride,
> Beloved by Heaven o'er all the world beside."

And who *know* that at this moment we rank among the First Powers of the world—a position which we not only claim, but are always ready and able to maintain.

The style you assume in addressing your Northern friends is in perfect keeping with your apparent estimation of them. Though I should be the last, perhaps, to criticise mere style, I could not but be struck with the extremely simple manner of your letter. You seem to have thought you were writing a Tract for benighted Heathen, and telling wonders never before suggested to their imagination, and so far above their untutored comprehension as to require to be related in the primitive language of "the child's own book." This is sufficiently amusing; and would be more so but for the coarse and bitter epithets you continually apply to the poor slave-holders—epithets which appear to be stereotyped for the use of Abolitionists, and which form a large and material part of all their arguments.

But perhaps the most extraordinary part of your letter is your bold denunciation of "*the shameful compromises*" of our Constitution, and your earnest recommendation to those you address to overthrow or revolutionize it. In so many words you say to them, "*you must either separate yourselves* from all political connexion with the South, and make your own laws; or if you do not choose such a separation you must break up *the political ascendancy which the Southern have had for so long a time over the Northern States.*" The italics in this as in all other quotations are your own. It is well for those who circulate your letter here, that the Constitution you denounce requires an overt act to constitute Treason. It may be tolerated for an American by birth, to use on his own soil the freedom of speaking and writing which is guarantied to him, and abuse our Constitution, our Union, and our people. But that a Foreigner should use such seditious language, in a Circular Letter addressed to a portion of the American people, is a presumption well calculated to excite the indignation of all. The party known in this country as the Abolition Party has long since avowed the sentiments you express, and adopted the policy you enjoin. At the recent Presidential Election they gave over 62,000 votes for their own Candidate, and held the balance of power in two of the largest States—wanting but little of doing it in several others. In the last four years their vote has quadrupled. Should the infatuation continue and their vote increase in the same ratio in the next four years, it will be as

large as the vote of the *actual slave-holders* of the Union. Such a prospect is doubtless extremely gratifying to you. It gives hope of a contest on such terms as may insure the downfall of Slavery or our Constitution. The South venerates the Constitution, and is prepared to stand by it forever, *such as it came from the hands of our fathers*; to risk everything to defend and maintain it *in its integrity*. But the South is under no such delusion as to believe that it derives any *peculiar* protection from the Union. On the contrary, it is well known we incur *peculiar danger* and that we bear far more than our proportion of the burdens. The apprehension is also fast fading away that any of the dreadful consequences commonly predicted will necessarily result from a separation of the States. And *come what may* we are firmly resolved that OUR SYSTEM OF DOMESTIC SLAVERY SHALL STAND. The fate of the Union then,—but thank God not of Republican Government—rests mainly in the hands of the people to whom your letter is addressed—the "professing Christians of the Northern States having no concern with slaveholding," and whom with incendiary zeal you are endeavoring to stir up to strife—without which fanaticism can neither live, move, nor have any being.

We have often been taunted for our sensitiveness in regard to the discussion of Slavery. Do not suppose it is because we have any doubts of our rights, or scruples about asserting them. There was a time when such doubts and scruples were entertained. Our ancestors opposed the introduction of Slaves into this country, and a feeling adverse to it was handed down from them. The enthusiastic love of liberty fostered by our Revolution strengthened this feeling. And before the commencement of the Abolition agitation here, it was the common sentiment that it was desirable to get rid of Slavery. Many thought it our duty to do so. When that agitation arose we were driven to a close examination of the subject in all its bearings, and the result has been an *universal conviction* that in holding Slaves we violate no law of God,—inflict no injustice on any of his creatures—while the terrible consequences of emancipation to all parties and the world at large, clearly revealed to us, make us shudder at the bare thought of it. The slaveholders are therefore indebted to the Abolitionists for perfect ease of conscience, and the satisfaction of a settled and unanimous determination in reference to this matter. And could their agitation cease now, I believe, after all, the good would preponderate over the evil of it in this country. On the contrary, however, it is urged on with frantic violence, and the Abolitionists, reasoning in the abstract, as if it were a mere moral or metaphysical speculation, or a minor question in politics, profess to be surprised at our exasperation. In their ignorance and recklessness they seem to be unable to comprehend our feelings or position. The subversion of our rights, the destruction of our property, the disturbance of our peace and the peace of the world, are matters which do

not appear to arrest their consideration. When Revolutionary France proclaimed "Hatred to Kings and unity to the Republic," and inscribed on her banners "France risen against Tyrants," she professed to be only worshipping "Abstract Rights." And if there can be such things, perhaps she was. Yet all Europe *rose* to put her sublime theories down. They declared her an enemy to the common peace; that her doctrines alone violated the "Law of Neighborhood," and, as Mr. BURKE said, justly entitled them to anticipate the "damnum nondum factum" of the civil law. DANTON, BARRERE and the rest were apparently astonished that umbrage should be taken. The parallel between them and the Abolitionists holds good in all respects.

The rise and progress of this Fanaticism is one of the phenomena of the age in which we live. I do not intend to repeat what I have already said, or to trace its career more minutely at present. But the Legislature of Great Britain will make it historical, and doubtless you must feel some curiosity to know how it will figure on the page of the Annalist. I think I can tell you. Though I have accorded and do accord to you and your party great influence in bringing about the Parliamentary action of your country, you must not expect to go down to posterity as the only cause of it. Though *you* trace the progenitors of Abolition from 1516 through a long stream with divers branches down to the period of its triumph in your country, it has not escaped contemporaries, and will not escape posterity, that England, without much effort sustained the storm of its scoffs and threats until the moment arrived when she thought her colonies fully supplied with Africans; and declared against the Slave Trade only when she deemed it unnecessary to her, and when her colonies full of Slaves would have great advantages over others not so well furnished. Nor did she agree to West India emancipation until, discovering the error of her previous calculation, it became an object to have slaves free throughout the Western world, and, on the ruins of the Sugar and Cotton growers of America and the Islands, to build up her great Slave Empire in the East: while her indefatigable exertions, still continued, to engraft the Right of Search upon the Law of Nations, on the plea of putting an end to the forever increasing Slave Trade, are well understood to have chiefly in view the complete establishment of her supremacy at Sea. On these points let me recommend you to consult a very able Essay on the Slave Trade and Right of Search by M. JOLLIVET, recently published; and as you say, since writing your Circular Letter, that you "burn to try your hand on another little Essay if a subject could be found," I propose to you to "try" to answer this question, put by M. JOLLIVET to England: "*Pourquoi sa philanthropie n'a pas daigne, jusqu' a present, doubler le cap de Bonne-Esperance?*" Nor must you flatter yourself that your party will derive historic dignity from the names of the illustrious British statesmen who have acted with it. Their

country's ends were theirs. They have stooped to use you, as the most illustrious men will sometimes use the vilest instruments, to accomplish their own purposes. A few philanthropic common places and rhetorical flourishes, "in the abstract," have secured them your "sweet voices," and your influence over the tribe of mawkish sentimentalists. WILBERFORCE may have been yours, but what was he besides, but a wealthy county member? You must therefore expect to stand on your own merits alone before posterity, or rather that portion of it that may be curious to trace the history of the Delusions which from time to time pass over the surface of human affairs, and who may trouble themselves to look through the ramifications of Transcendentalism in this era of extravagances. And how do you expect to appear in their eyes? As Christians, piously endeavoring to enforce the will of God and carry out the principles of Christianity? Certainly not, since you deny or pervert the Scriptures in the doctrines you advance; and in your conduct furnish a glaring contrast to the examples of Christ and the Apostles.—As Philanthropists, devoting yourselves to the cause of humanity, relieving the needy, comforting the afflicted, creating peace and gladness and plenty round about you? Certainly not; since you turn from the needy, the afflicted; from strife, sorrow and starvation which surround you; close your eyes and hands upon them; shut out from your thoughts and feelings the human misery which is real, tangible, and within your reach, to indulge your morbid imagination in conjuring up woes and wants among a strange people in distant lands, and offering them succor in the shape of costless denunciations of their best friends, or by scattering among them "firebrands, arrows and death." Such folly and madness—such wild mockery and base imposture, can never win for you, in the sober judgement of future times, the name of Philanthropists. Will you even be regarded as worthy citizens? Scarcely, when the purposes you have in view can only be achieved by revolutionizing governments and overturning social systems, and when you do not hesitate zealously and earnestly to recommend such measures. Be assured, then, that posterity will not regard the Abolitionists as Christians, Philanthropists, or virtuous citizens. It will, I have no doubt, look upon the mass of the party as silly enthusiasts, led away by designing characters, as is the case with all parties that break from the great, acknowledged ties which bind civilized man in fellowship. The leaders themselves will be regarded as *mere ambitious men;* not taking rank with those whose ambition is "eagle-winged and sky-aspiring," but belonging to that mean and selfish class who are instigated by "rival-hating envy," and whose base thirst is for *Notoriety;* who cloak their designs under vile and impious hypocrisies, and, unable to shine in higher spheres, devote themselves to Fanaticism, as a trade. And it will be perceived that, even in that, they shunned the highest walk. Religious Fanaticism was an old established

vocation, in which something brilliant was required to attract attention. They could not be GEORGE FOXES, nor JOANNA SOUTHCOTES, nor even JOE SMITHS. But the dullest pretender could discourse a jumble of pious bigotry, natural rights, and drivelling philanthropy. And, addressing himself to aged folly and youthful vanity, to ancient women, to ill-gotten wealth, to the reckless of all classes who love excitement and change, offer all the cheapest and the safest glory in the market. Hence, their numbers; and, from number and clamor, what impression they have made on the world.

Such I am persuaded is the light in which the Abolitionists will be viewed by the posterity their history may reach. Unless, indeed—which God forbid—circumstances should so favor as to enable them to produce a convulsion which may elevate them higher on the "bad eminence" where they have placed themselves.

I have the honor to be
Your obedient servant,
J. H. HAMMOND.

THOMAS CLARKSON, Esq.

NOTE.—The foregoing Letters were not originally intended for publication. In preparing them for the press they have been revised. The alterations and corrections made however have been mostly verbal. Had the writer felt at liberty to condense the two letters into one, and bring up the history of Abolition to the period of publication, he might have presented a more concise and perfect argument, and illustrated his views more forcibly by reference to facts recently developed. For example, since writing the first, the letter of Mr. CLARKSON, as President of the British Anti-Slavery Society, to Sir ROBERT PEEL, denouncing the whole scheme of "Immigration," has reached him; and after he had forwarded the last, he saw it stated that Mr. CLARKSON had as late as the first part of April, addressed the Earl of ABERDEEN, and declared that all efforts to suppress the African Slave Trade had fully failed. It may be confidently expected that it will be ere long announced from the same quarter, that the "experiment" of West-India Emancipation has also proved a complete abortion.

Should the terms which have been applied to the Abolitionists appear to any as unduly severe, let it be remembered that the direct aim of these people is to destroy us by the most shocking of all processes; and that, having a large portion of the civilized world for their audience, they daily and systematically heap upon us the vilest calumnies and most unmitigated abuse. Clergymen lay aside their Bibles and Females unsex themselves to carry on this horrid warfare against Slave-holders.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1845, by
A. G. Summer,
In the Office of the Clerk of the District Court of South Carolina.

54 W

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS